The property of J. P. Bliemaker, New Market, Virginia, by way of Division

CAROLINIAN

HERALD OF LIBERTY,

Religious and Political;

OR, a T... ...y against attempted measures, which in their nature are calcu... ...ded to the establishment of Popery among Protestants.....in an ORA...ON. There are also other subjects inserted in this little Work, highly interesting to the Lutheran community:

BY DAVID HENKEL,

Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, residing in Lincoln Co. N. Carolina.

"Nam mysterium jam operatur iniquitatis, solum tenens nunc donec e medio fiat."

"Et tunc revelabitur ille exlex, quem Dominus interficiet spiritu oris sui, et destruet illustratione adventus sui," &c.

II. EPISTOLA ST. PAULI AD THESS. CAPUT II.

SALISBURY, N. C.

PRINTED BY KRIDER & BINGHAM,

1821.

INTRODUCTION.

The following ORATION is published as a precaution against a plan which was proposed by a Committee appointed by the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania, assisted by an individual from this State, at Baltimore, A. D. 1819. It is by no means intended to ridicule all the ministers of that venerable body: The strictures in said Oration are rather intended to apply to some leading characters only. Neither are they intended, (with the exception of a few sentences,) to censure their motives as much as their proposed measures. I have reasons to believe, that the plan was not maturely contemplated by all who voted for it. I have not yet understood, that said plan has been adopted by a majority of Synods in the United States. Agreeably to this, there must be a goodly number who think with me in this case. The Synod of Ohio, if my information by some of my northern correspondents be correct, are decidedly against it, and the Synod of New-York concurring in the same sentiment. I must yet observe, that the Synod of Pennsylvania have hitherto endeavored to support a good character. Their Evangelical Magazine, indeed, (with one exception, which is noted in the following Oration,) breathes the pure spirit of the Gospel, and displays genuine knowledge and piety in the writers. No doubt the intentions of many were good, when they purposed to cultivate a more intimate union with us of the remoter States, by the establishment of a General Synod: howbeit, they may be assured, that as many of us as know our Lord are already closely united—no human bulwark can make us more so. Our affections will also be much stronger towards them, provided our present mode of Church government be preserved. Let them not attempt to deviate from the Augsburgh Confession of Faith, and our love and union shall never be clouded.

THE AUTHOR.

Lincoln County, N. C. 1820.

RBE
E Plm
12mo
2067

AN ORATION.

LUTHERANS OF NORTH-AMERICA, GIVE ATTENTION!

BRETHREN:

Do ye not think, amidst so many revolutions in the church, it is time for us to inquire whether our doctrine has not been spurned, an invasion upon our rights attempted, and destruction threatened to the simplicity of our church discipline? Many are fond of being sheltered under the renowned name of Luther; they think it an honour to claim kindred with him, for as much as he is acknowledged by the protestant world to have been the blessed instrument of Reformation from papal superstition, the flaming Uriel, with his golden lamp kindled at the altar of heaven, flying through the horizon, and shedding abroad floods of everlasting light, over the benighted Eastern hemisphere, whilst kings and nations were basking in its lustre. But many of those pretenders to Lutheranism are void of Lutheran principles; they only thus denominate themselves through improper motives. The Augsburgh confession of faith is the point of union among all Lutherans, and their ministers are solemnly pledged in its defence. The reason of this is, because it is considered fully scriptural. It stood the test against the papists, in the assembled Diet of Germany; its doctrines defied all opposition; its contents the very vitals of the holy religion of Jesus; its truths like the immovable pillars of the universe, and fair like the gilded morning, have traversed the Atlantic ocean, blessing its German Sons in the wilderness of America. Can I then be an idle spectator, and view with criminal indifference the measures that are taken to effect its destruction? No: duty constrains me; the tongueless woes inflicted upon our bleeding churches, rouse me to opposition, and stimulate my mind from the revery. In the year 1819, a plan was projected not hitherto adopted by the Lutheran community. It is a plan for the purpose of organizing a general assembly, which passes under the sweet name of a general union of all Lutherans. Nothing is better calculated to cast a veil over improper measures, than pretensions to union. But have not Lutherans always been united? Though a general assembly never heretofore exercised jurisdiction over this church; yet, annually her children increased in numbers, ministers and congregations were concerted families. Schism was a stranger, brotherly love was like the crescent of the moon, their communion sweeter than the sweet ambrosial hive, and their rural scenes

full of temporal felicity. Is it not very paradoxical, that some of their ministers now project a plan to unite a people who were never divided? I need no better proof of this, than what the projectors of the plan-proposals themselves admit in the introduction of said plan. It is there asserted, that the Lutherans from time to time endeavoured to preserve unity among themselves. I dare venture to say that unity has been preserved, before the plan-proposals appeared. If so, was not that sufficient.

It is my design to shew what the consequences of this plan, if adopted, in the nature of things may be, without impeaching the projectors with a criminality of motives. Although it might seem as if some improper motive might be concealed at the bottom, yet I leave God, the searcher of all hearts, to judge in this case. I consider it a duty, which I owe to my brethren, to explain this subject, as clearly as I am able. I shall take the 1st, 2d, 4th, 5th, and 7th, articles of their plan-proposals into consideration.* To the others I have not such great objections. The first article says: "The central connection of the Lutheran church in these United States, shall be established and preserved under the title, The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran church in the U. States of North America."

Agreeably to this, the unity of the Lutheran church, in America, would centre in a general Synod, invested with authority to prescribe uniform ceremonies, and to govern individual Synods by a general law. Is such a bulwark necessary to union? If it is not now, yet it would be made so after its establishment. Hence, if it were then necessary, why was it not so always? If it was always necessary, where then has been the union heretofore, as there was not always a general Synod? Was there no union heretofore? No one, I hope, will say that there was not. If there was, since when has it become necessary to effect it by a general Synod? Have not some of the projectors of this plan owned other regular Lutherans as united brethren? Why then is there a plan projected to unite the united? Endeavouring to effect a union, presupposes a schism! Is there a schism, how came it then that all regular Lutherans have been owned as brethren? O, were the pretensions to brotherhood sincere, the church would soon appear, serene like the unclouded atmosphere, pleasing like paradisiacal fields, arrayed in living green, beautiful like love, shining with the sunbeams of heaven, with orient wings expanded from pole to pole, whose cementing cords are not

* These proposals were printed in the German Language, in Baltimore, 1819.

uniformity of human ceremonies, nor her rallying point general Synods, such as established by men ; the place of her nativity is the bosom of God ; and has for her abode the circle of creation. But, let me attend to the reasons which are urged for the necessity of a general assembly, which, if only superficially viewed, appear very plausible. They are : " If the Lutheran church be spread over a vast territory, unnecessary differences with respect to doctrines and discipline may take place ; therefore a general Synod becomes necessary to maintain the cords of unity. How, without that, can a body of divines be censured, if they should deviate from sound doctrine ?" The Lutherans have already a standard : the Augsburgh confession of faith, which is considered scriptural. It is naturally understood that every Synod must act in conformity thereto ; and such as depart from it are not considered Lutherans. Such who transgress the rules of doctrine and discipline of the Synods to which they belong, would also disregard all the rules of a general Synod, unless such a general Synod were incorporated by civil authority. Experience proves this. Several other denominations who are governed by general Synods, have experienced many disagreeable divisions ; but did we ever hear of schisms among Lutherans, especially before the plan-proposals were projected ?

That a general Synod is better calculated to preserve purity in doctrine and discipline than individual bodies, remains yet to be proved. A general assembly is composed of individuals ; now if individuals, as such, are liable to err, will they not be equally liable to err, when they are convened together? Can that make them wiser ? If a general assembly were not liable to err, as well as individuals, then the cause of the protestant church must be wrong, and the victory be yielded to the papists ; because they were styled the general church, who declared the protestants excommunicated. Why do not such as are of the opinion, that a great majority are not so liable to err, return to the Romish church? But if a general Synod is liable to err, which protestants must own, what purpose can it answer? Such a Synod may err ; and that which may err, may err in rectifying that which may err. What benefit can it be to the church, to have an erring general Synod, to rectify individual Synods? Now it must either follow that such a general Synod must be infallible, or else it is to no christian purpose. All the purpose it might answer, would be for a certain class of men to mount upon the horse of popularity.

That general councils, or a great majority, have often erred, and the words of our Lord : " Wide is the gate, and broad the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat," have often been verified, is evident from history.

A few examples may suffice. How many false prophets, forming a large majority, were conspired against the prophet Elijah! But were they right? No. In the days of our Saviour's humiliation, how many were on his side? A very little flock, chiefly consisting of fishermen, and such as were of the poorest class. Lo! the multitude in opposition; even condemning him to the ignominious death of the cross! Who was right? He, like a victorious captain of salvation, rose again, hell trembled beneath his feet, he opened with his cross, as with a key, the emerald gates of the holiest place; and has since proved, that he is the only king of kings, his words to be infallible and his government wise and invincible. Lo! the papists with their numbers, against a few of the Reformers. Who was right? Protestants in general are ready to decide this question in their own behalf.

Whenever the government of such an assembly should be recognised, their laws and ceremonies would have to be observed on pain of excommunication, as shall be further illustrated. Gradually, by this mean, the church would become imitative of civil authority, although our Saviour says, "My kingdom is not of this world," as the Jews vainly imagined, and in which his own disciples sought distinction. It would also prepare the way for a visible head to be created. This is the very soul of popery, "*a visible union of all Christians, centering in a supreme visible head, and allowing no invisible without a visible unity, the true mark of the Christian church.*" A general assembly having supreme jurisdiction, is the same as a visible head, if not individually, yet collectively. An hundred delegated to exercise supreme jurisdiction, must be considered as one; because they must act jointly, or, at least, so by a majority. Now if no union be acknowledged but such as centres in a General Synod, then the papish motto, "No union without a visible head," would become a maxim among Protestants. As soon as there is a tribunal of the church acknowledged besides that of Christ, or in his stead, then ancient popery is again recognised, with all its horrors. A General Assembly is a supreme tribunal, from which no appeal can be made without a schism. It was by general councils that the first pope became elevated to his superior dignity. Do not like causes for ever produce like effects? Did the organization of general councils once create popery? Will the same cause now not have the same effect? O, Protestants! where are any of you that are not struck with indignation, when a venerable chronicler paints to your minds the pope's enormous pretensions; arrogating to himself the vicegerency of Christ; poisoning all the pure waters of life; who, being a monster in human shape, red with the fires of hell, premeditating destruc-

tion with fire and sword by the Inquisition; his flag unfurled, written full of blasphemies, reeking with innocent blood? How can any of you, who participate in the woes of mankind, lay a similar foundation, which in its nature is calculated to terminate in scenes too bloody and horrible to be depicted? Is union to centre in General Synod? Are all to be considered schismatics who do not obey their mandates? How, then, can Christ be the alone object of union? Is he the most perfect object of union? how is it possible to make the most perfect more perfect, by an addition of a General Assembly? If union is also to centre in a General Synod, how, then, can it centre in Christ only? Whosoever is justified by Christ, is also united to him: his soul being impressed with his lovely image, he is in fellowship with all saints and angels in the universe, whether they dwell in any of the regions here below, or in the high climes of bliss. The union of believers, like their king, is invisible—"their life being hid with Christ in God;" it therefore does not matter whether their human ceremonies and modes of government harmonize. All their union which is discoverable, is their uniform obedience to the Lord's commandments: but carnal and full of darkness must be the eye that can see no union unless it be in a General Synod. Whatsoever is necessary to Christian union, is also necessary to justification. Justification through Christ unites all believers, independent of any thing else. How, then, in this case, should conformity in human ceremonies, &c. become necessary? Would the General Synod not have all their members to observe the laws and ceremonies they would be pleased to make? But in case some of the members would not observe them, but such as they would make themselves, and ordain ministers and establish synods without their charter; how would the General Synod deal with such? Would they not coerce them to obedience, or else finally exclude them from their fellowship? They certainly would; otherwise the organization of such an assembly would be useless. Now for what reason ought any person to be excommunicated from the church? It must be granted, that a person ought only to be excommunicated for such crimes as would debar him from the inheritance of heaven. But if any one is to be excommunicated for not observing the mandates of the General Synod, then it must also be considered such a crime as would debar one from heaven. If this be the case, they become necessary to justification, which is repugnant to the scriptural doctrine of the Protestants. Uniformity of human ceremonies, &c. and a visible head, were considered necessary among the papists; and this was the reason that the doctrine of free justification and Christian liberty became so darkened and oblivious, that it required the Lord

of Hosts to make bare his holy arm in restoring it, by the instrumentality of the Reformers, to a benighted world. Should the same (viz. a visible head or General Synod) now be considered necessary, and be adopted, then, alas! we may put the light kindled in the Reformation under a bushel; we may draw the veil of death over our eyes; Christian liberty may hide her lovely face, and weep tears of blood; and O! farewell ye happy seats of freedom, where virtue had found an asylum; farewell thou sweet doctrine of free justification, through the crucified—thou balm of Gilead, thou consolation to the afflicted; hail, horrors and scenes of destruction! ye must be the dreadful companions to mankind.

The second article of the plan-proposals shows how each Synod is to be represented in the General Synod—viz:

"Each Synod, of six ministers, may send one deputy; of fourteen, two; of twenty-five, three; of forty, four; of sixty, five; and of eighty-six, six deputies to the General Synod, from the order of the ministry; and for every two such deputies, one lay deputy; and also one lay deputy for the Synod consisting of six ministers: and that all such deputies shall have equal votes."

This mode of representation will give all the authority into the hands of the ministry: because there are to be two ministers for one lay deputy. Lay deputies might as well be altogether excluded, since their numbers are not to be commensurate. The most numerous Synod would also have the greatest influence, which is that of Pennsylvania. Indeed, the very least is to be represented; yet the greatest is to claim the pre-eminence. Recognising this article, is at once surrendering the rights and privileges of the lesser Synods to the greater ones: for if they did not freely acquiesce in their decisions, they would finally be compelled to do it by a majority of votes. Let me state to you, brethren, the consequences of this greater representation against the lesser, in the nature of things, is calculated to produce. The Synod of Pennsylvania, the most numerous, will have it in their power to adopt almost any resolution; or they might form the constitution of the General Synod to their best local advantage. Who can tell but what a clause might be inserted, that a general Seminary should be established in the very bosom of Pennsylvania; and that none should be promoted in the ministry unless he had received his education there? I do not positively say that this would be the case; nor do I censure the present Synod with such sinister motives; but they have left an open door for their successors to do so, if they please; and the weakness of human nature is such, as to be very apt to prostitute power to selfish views. A general Seminary established in that state, would

not only cause many sums of money to flow there from the various parts of the Union, but it would also fan the fires of the spirit of aggrandizement. The mind of (carnal) man is such as to be delighted in something that makes a grand appearance, and that is denominated by high sounding epithets: such as, "*a General Synod;*" *a General Seminary, in a great City.* Such a one has studied there, hence he must be a very great man. When a certain resolution, which was adopted by the Synod of Pennsylvania, (or a majority of them,) is considered, the reader cannot censure me for entertaining the above ideas. It was resolved by said Synod, in 1815, "That only such can be ordained pastors who have, for the space of three years, received a systematic education with an ordained minister, and have made some progress in the languages." See Evangelical Magazine of 1816, page 11. If this resolution was not erroneously committed to paper, it bears symptoms of contracted views. Is there no possibility of acquiring the necessary qualifications for the office of the ministry, without studying three years with an ordained minister? "He must have made some progress in the languages." In which of them? How vague! In the German and English, in any other of the modern, or in the classical languages? No doubt but what the latter are intended, yet by no means specified. A wealthy person might afford to pursue this course, notwithstanding he still might remain a coxcomb; yet, because he has studied three years with an ordained minister, he is entitled to a pastoral ordination: whereas, the most illustrious genius, highly improved, and living in a remote corner, no ordained minister near him, nor having the means to go far abroad, he cannot become a pastor, but must for ever remain contracted in his usefulness! Why so? Because he has not studied three years with an ordained minister!! Is this the spirit of Jesus? or congenial to that of American patriotism, which is far removed from proud, sanguine European nobility, adorning with chaplets only such who distinguish themselves by their qualifications and merits, no matter how acquired or achieved? From this view of things, it is safest to use every means of precaution.

In this article it is also proposed, "*That it should be left to the option of every Synod how to appoint their deputies, and how to defray their travelling expenses.*" Why are not the travelling expenses to be paid out of the general treasury? The greatest Synod, with her representation, may appoint the place of the meeting of the General Synod where they please; hence in their midst, so that their deputies would not have far to travel, therefore not many expenses to defray; but the

poor frontier deputies, who would have many hundred miles distance to travel, might have the liberty to provide for themselves in this respect. Into their midst they would have to come, or else obey what would be decreed without their presence. Is it for Pennsylvania to sway her regal sceptre over her sister states, with her major representation? Is she alone the temple of the Lord? She, indeed, has many pious, learned men, highly esteemed, who are an ornament to the church; but she must know that other states are not void of such, who know how to estimate their spiritual liberty; who, whilst they are animated with freedom's blood, will not, as men and Christians, surrender their privileges to a superior representation.

The fourth article of this plan-proposal says, that "The General Synod, with the concurrence of a majority of particular Synods, have exclusive authority to introduce new books for the public use in churches, as well as to make amendments in the Liturgy; but *until* that is done, the hymn books or compilation of hymns, the smaller catechism of Luther, the liturgies already adopted, and such other books which are now received by the present Synods as symbolical, shall remain in public use; but the General Synod shall have no authority to make, or to request, any alteration in any of the Creeds hitherto adopted by us." This article, if recognised, would take away the liberty of individuals and individual Synods, with respect to the forming and introducing of books and liturgies for the public use in churches. A liturgy prescribes ceremonies and regulations for public worship, and other transactions. Many of these are merely human, relative to local circumstances. Now if none shall have the privilege to prescribe a liturgy but only the General Synod, and none to be considered as members of the church unless they be governed by it, then it would be the same as to say, Observe uniform ceremonies as established by men, or else no union! The term "exclusive," sufficiently demonstrates this; because it is thereby indicated, that such authority is claimed by the General Synod only. It would then be in the power of the General Synod to introduce entire new books, and such, too, which even did not contain the Lutheran doctrine. It is not said that the present books, such as Luther's catechism, &c. should remain the standard books; but that they should be retained in use *until*—"*Until*" when? Until the General Synod shall introduce new books. The term "until," shows that our present symbolical books may only be of a temporary use. Would they reject Luther's catechism, our present liturgies, hymns, and the Augsburgh confession of faith, and introduce others in lieu of them? I do not know. But they would have exclusive authority to do so

if they pleased. Had the projectors of this plan positively intended that our present creeds and symbolical books should always be retained in use, why was there not a clause inserted to that amount? It is true that this article states, "that the General Synod shall have no authority to make any alterations in any of the creeds hitherto adopted by us." But how indefinite! No alteration is to be made in any of our creeds: Our creeds can every one of them be omitted and rejected, if only they be not altered. To alter a creed, and to omit a creed, are two different things. They would need no alteration if they were rejected. Why is this article not expressed in positive terms, that no creed hitherto adopted by us, should neither be omitted, rejected, or altered? Agreeably to this, Luther's catechism, and the Augsburgh confession of faith, might be omitted without a breach of the article. Brethren, where are any of you who have not solemnly vowed obedience to their doctrines, when ye were confirmed, by the imposition of hands and prayer? Are they not invaluable treasures of God, bequeathed to our forefathers when they were liberated from the chains of popery? They are testimonies of the Holy Ghost in the house of God, and the heavenly productions of the Reformation. What a criminal sacrilege it would be to effect their destruction! They, indeed, have derived their validity and divine glory from the holy scriptures, which ought to be the foundation of all churches, with respect to doctrine and discipline. The Bible is not once mentioned in the planposals for a General Synod! All that is said, is, that none of our creeds should be altered: Thus the Bible itself might be omitted, if it only be not altered; and without restraint, any system of infidelity might be established. Although I am confident that none of the projectors aim at such a thing—and perhaps they detest the very idea—yet I consider it my duty to lay before them their inattention in this respect. But these are not the greatest objections I have against this article. It is subversive to the liberty guaranteed to all Lutherans, by the 7th article of the Augsburgh confession of faith; which expressly saith, "It is sufficient for the true unity of the Christian Church, that the preaching be pure, according to the true understanding of the Gospel, and the sacraments administered according to divine Scripture; and it is not necessary for the true unity of the Christian Church, that the same ceremonies as established by men should be observed, as St. Paul saith, Eph. 4, "One body, one spirit, as ye all are called to the same hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism." It is to be observed, that the Reformers were opposed to the principles of the papists, who had obscured the doctrine of free

justification through Christ by their human traditions. They imposed all their uniform ceremonies and traditions upon the church, as necessary to christian unity. Now the Reformers knew that this was contrary to the doctrine of free justification; hence this 7th article was wisely inserted, declaring that it was not necessary to the true unity of the church that the same ceremonies as established by men should be observed. The pure preaching of the Gospel, and the proper administration of the sacraments, become justly necessary, because they are no human inventions, but positive institutions of Jesus Christ. Human ceremonies, in their proper place, are not sinful; but they become so whenever they are imposed as necessary to unity. Neither was circumcision sinful in itself; but when it was urged as necessary to salvation, the Apostle does not hesitate to pronounce such in a lost state that were circumcised. But this article of the plan-proposal allows exclusive authority to the General Synod to impose a uniform liturgy, catechism, &c. upon the whole connexion: Her mandates are to be obeyed; and thus uniformity of human ceremonies are made necessary to christian unity, contrary to the 7th article of the Augsburgh confession of faith. O, Lutheran ministers! such of you who are the votaries of this General Synod plan, what must your conscience tell you, when ye recall to your minds the days of your ordinations, when ye solemnly swore to maintain the very article your plan is calculated to subvert? In vain you inurn Luther, and shelter yourselves under the sacred covert of his name; in vain you deem it an honor to claim kindred with him, who was the Orpheus of Germany, the hero of the Gospel, and the terror to popery, unless ye continue to be animated with his spirit.

In the 5th article of their plan, it is proposed, "That no Synod should be established without a charter from the General Synod; and that no ordination should be considered as valid, that was imparted by a Synod not chartered by the General Synod." At present, and as the church has heretofore been governed, a charter from a General Synod was never considered necessary to the establishment of a Synod. There is no Lutheran Synod in the United States which has been chartered by a General Synod; and, I dare venture to say, none in Europe. The first Lutheran churches were established without it. Did the Roman Catholic church, who were the majority, give Luther and his adherents charters? No. Instead of that, they excommunicated them, and declared all the ordinations they imparted, as invalid. Notwithstanding, all such protestant ordinations which came through the apostolical channel, if even performed by individuals, are by them

generally considered to be divinely valid. We have not only a precedent in the pristine church, with respect to this, but also the warrants of the holy Scriptures. The inauguration of Christ as a High Priest, by John the Baptist, in Jordan, whilst the impenetrable doors of heaven opened; whilst the Father spake ineffably mild, and the Holy Ghost, that celestial dove, anointed him with the oil of gladness, above his fellows: Without a charter from the Sanhedrim of the Jews, his office maintains its validity for ever and ever. The commission our Saviour gave to his Apostles, though not ratified by a General Synod of men, is still valid; and the individual ordinations they imparted will for ever remain authoritative, and their ministerial succession will reach the very gates of New Jerusalem. It is an undeniable fact, that the ordinations which are in existence among protestants, have been derived from individual sources; yet their validity is not questioned. Now whereas, such ordinations have always been admitted to be valid, since when have they lost their validity? Should they always have been valid, until Trinity week of 1819, when a committee in the great city of Baltimore proposed, that no ordination should be considered valid unless imparted by a chartered Synod? If a charter from a General Synod becomes necessary hereafter to make an ordination valid, why was it not always so heretofore? There is no such ordination among us now; hence, if this is to become a maxim, that none shall be valid unless imparted by a chartered Synod, we will at once cause the world to believe that there is not a single protestant minister legally ordained, and that they were all a horde of impostors! The aforesaid article proposes to pronounce all unchartered Synods which may be established hereafter, to be illegal. No Lutheran Synod being chartered, how then can any one, or more than one when they compose a General Synod, give charters? Jejune must be the idea, and grotesque the pretension, for unchartered Synods in a conclave to pronounce other Synods illegal, merely because they are not chartered! Unchartered Synods give charters! Lo! what an exotic plant is this! at first germinated in hell, fostered by the old harlot in the garden of Rome; poisoning all that is pure, and destroying all that is lovely; metamorphosed into a maniac demon, in the disguise of religion, is now proposed to be transplanted into the clarified soil of Lutheranism, which fills the agile mind with anticipated horrors of popery revived, even upon the unsullied shores of America. Could there be a better weapon given to the papists, to overturn the protestant cause, than what the projectors of the aforesaid article have done? One of the peculiar diabolical depths of popery is, that that no

church can be regular, no ordination valid, unless chartered by the Roman Catholic; and upon this ground she fulminates her anathemas against all protestants. Is not what is proposed in the aforesaid article similar in its nature, when no ordination shall be considered valid, unless imparted by a Synod chartered by the General Synod? Let this become a maxim among the protestants, may the papists not justly argue, that they alone are a regular church, and the protestants to be schismatics, not being chartered by the church universal? How would it be possible for protestants, upon this supposition, to support themselves as a regular church? It would be out of the question: they must be silent for ever; surrender their independency; offer their hecatombs upon the altar of idols; and, like pusillanimous deserters, on bended knees, at the footstool of Rome, implore her majesty for charters, lest, by their own concessions, they lose their ecclesiastical existence.

The 7th article of the plan-proposal says, "That the General Synod, with the concurrence of a majority of particular Synods, shall have the authority to determine general valid grades in the ministry." This article is no where restricted how far they would be allowed to go in this respect. Whether fewer grades than are among us now would be determined, or whether their numbers would be increased, is not known; yet this article allows them to form as many as they please. Who can tell but what there might be as many formed as there are in all popedom—or even enthrone a pope for America? There are four grades of ministers already existing, should there none more be formed; yet, if the General Synod be formed with their officers, there would be a hierarchy replete. There would be the president and delegates of the General Synod; the presidents of individual Synods, with the four grades already mentioned; thus the number, seven, would be full. The whore of Rome rides upon seven mountains, and the beast has seven horns: And what a fair opportunity is offered by this article, to introduce the mystic seven of iniquity into the Lutheran church. Who can deny but what many grades in the ministry is one of the peculiar lifestrings of popery, and one of the lineaments of its image? and all that is wanting, is the breath of life to be blown into its nostrils, for it to become a living beast, which may gore all the other beasts of the field. Lo! the gorgeous President of the General Synod, at the head of all Lutherans in America; enthroned, a sceptred monarch, gloomy, and peculiar, and unrivaled; forgetting that his predecessor Martin was a poor excommunicated monk: he has delegates for his life-guard, presidents his emissaries, pastors his common people, deacons his servants,

candidates and catechets his out-posts, and congregations his footstool. What may be the reason that fair, independent Lutheranism, the puissant arm, nerved by the Lord, to pull down the Dagon walls of seven-headed popery, should now itself, even where freedom's emblazoned flag unfurled waves in mild aurora's beams, be suborned into a seven-headed monster! If Luther was now to rise from his grave, and come to America, what would he say at hearing that those who called themselves after his name, had opened so wide a door for the establishment of many grades in the ministry? Would he own them as protestant brethren?

Having thus briefly viewed some of the articles of the proposals for a General Synod of the Lutheran Church, I must yet observe, that the design of some does not stop here. The establishment of a *national church* is in view; not only by some of the Lutherans, but also of other denominations. The most sanguine expectations are entertained that all Christian denominations will, ere long, join in one body. That such is the case, does not only appear from many verbal expressions, but also from printed propositions, of which, if necessary, I could produce a sufficient testimony. The attempt for a national Synod is introduced under the garb of a universal brotherhood among all christians, and to hasten the period when they shall have but one shepherd, and be one flock. Now it is supposed by many, that this period being nearly at hand, nothing is wanting to form the zenith of unity but an agreement to be governed by a national assembly, to lay aside all party distinctions, and to drop controversial subjects of doctrine for ever. This, then, would be the blessed Millennium predicted by the holy scriptures. Such are the visionary dreams of many in our days; hence the labor with assiduity to promote this cause; and being the heralds of the destruction of party walls, they anticipate in sharing great honors in this new dispensation. But let me examine these things a little closer. The scriptures certainly predict a very harmonious time, which shall commence before heaven and earth shall blaze in the final conflagration, a period whose duration shall be a thousand years; the jubilant sabbath of the world, ushered in by ten thousand myriads of bright Urim, and the rushing sound of the chariot of paternal Deity, shining from the east even unto the west; reigning in his meridian glory, whose ensign, dipped in his divine blood, is planted on Zion's hill, whereunto the nations shall assemble. But before such a charming union can take place; before such imparadised beatitude can embrace the human family, all must become of one heart and mind, and be like instrumental harmony. To unite

the different denominations must be a vain undertaking, before they believe uniform doctrines. Differences in doctrine at first caused them to be separate people ; hence the effects will never cease, until the cause be stopped. As soon as all believe one doctrine, then the cause of division ceases ; union then, without any further exertions, will be the infallible result. Nevertheless, the votaries of the National Synod, bent upon their designs, declare that disputed doctrines, such as divide the different christian denominations, should be dropped. Controversial sermons are even deemed by many to be sinful, because they have a tendency to offend some, at least such who cannot support their rotten systems by sound arguments. What language is more current among people at this time, indicative of ignorance and lukewarmness, than the following? viz: "It does not matter what or how one believes, if the heart only means it well; whatever any one thinks to be right, is right, (at least to him.) * "*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*" What an encouragement to lukewarmness! What is the heart of man, that any one can plead its meaning well in a state of error? It is treacherously wicked, and a fool only depends upon it. The understanding must be illuminated, so as to embrace nothing but the truth, before the soul can fully enjoy God. Our blessed Lord saith, "*He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.*" John VII. 38. Not he that believeth any way, only meaning it well, but "*he that believeth as the scripture hath said,*" &c. The human soul does not only possess a will to mean well, but also an understanding to view the beauties of divine truths. Is it rational that the will only, the half of the soul, should be devoted to the service of God? A divided soul! how can that be well pleasing to him? The understanding, that noble faculty, by which the soul claims kindred with angels, and walks the planetary regions, is it possible that it should be excluded from the enjoyment of genuine knowledge, and leave all to the well-meaning of the will? Was Christ indifferent concerning the truth? Did he leave it

* "*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind,*" Rom. 14, v. 5. This verse is shamefully perverted by some, who imagine whatever any man believes to be right, is right to him, if it should be ever so wrong; because, *let every man* be *persuaded in his own mind.* But the Apostle, in the preceding part of the verse, only saith, "*One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike.*" And then he saith, "*Let every man be fully persuaded,*" &c. If this were true, that whatsoever any one believed to be right, that it then would be right, it would not have been necessary for the holy Scriptures to be revealed, because every one might have followed his own imagination, and be right. He might be a murderer, thief, &c. and be right, because he believed it to be right; therefore it would be right to him. Most shocking conclusion!

to the well-meaning of the Pharisees, and the common populace? No: His life was devoted to it; he did not only die as a sacrifice, but also as a martyr, for the sake of the truth, when he witnessed a good confession before Pontius Pilate. Does it now become those who are called his servants, to be silent upon points of doctrine, when there is nothing upon divine record which is a matter of indifference—treacherously to cry out peace, peace, when there is no peace, and to please all denominations, so that a general peace, a National Synod, might be the result? It is evident, that the different creeds of the several denominations cannot all be scriptural: there must be heresies among some of them; because they clash, even in matters of importance. Their doctrines are to be known by their books of confession and discipline; and their ministers are commonly pledged to them, as by an oath, when ordained. Now it is impossible for any of them to preach so as to please all denominations, without disguising and omitting some of his sentiments. To do so, would it not be breaking the most solemn vows, made through ordination? All would have to drop disputed points, before all could be united: if so, there would be a union formed of persons with broken vows! It then would become necessary that every minister should learn to believe his own creed, and every opposite one, before he could become a feather of this variegated halcyon. He must possess the art of pleasing all, a conscience pliable to every creed, and alive to every touch of interest. He must be a Lutheran, a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, an Independent, a Methodist, a Baptist, a Roman Catholic, a Quaker, a Mennonite, a Shaking Quaker, a Moravian, a Universalian, a Republican and a Royalist, a Tattler and a Free Mason, a Jew, a Mahometan, a Pagan, and an Infidel! Lo! a divided union—a united division! A connexion neither cold nor hot: not cold nor indifferent with respect to temporal interest, nor the love of fame; nor hot in charity, nor zealous in maintaining the peculiar doctrines of Christ. Here the coldness on the one hand, and the hotness on the other, mixed together, will form such a climate that all manner of amphibious animals may live in its waters, even those of the dark nether regions may live in them without freezing.

Such a national Synod might draw the cords of ministers closer together, make their temporal interests common, increase their influence, magnify their grandeur, and, by degrees, be established by civil authority. There have been too many of the clergy, (especially of the Eastern and Northern states,) complaining and railing against our government for not establishing the church by civil authority, giving them their annual

stipends by taxation. Lo! what numbers of clandestine worshippers of monarchy and of law regulated or political religion, who are dissatisfied with the liberties the common and poor people enjoy. They are enamoured with the grandeur of the monarchs of Europe, like the children of Israel in the days of Samuel were with those of the surrounding heathens. Many are not satisfied that they enjoy citizenship, free protection in their cause, and have every opportunity to manifest their usefulness; whereas their predecessors, the Apostles, were continually persecuted, exposed to peril and death: but they cannot rest until they be secular princes—until a gorgeous king be enthroned—until orders of knighthoods and nobilities be created for America. Our civil constitution, the best production of the kind the world ever saw, with outspread wings, equally protecting the rich and the poor, and is the citadel of our sacred temple of liberty, reared in our wide extended Union, whose spires meet the clouds—she, as if wisely inspired, knows what tends to our national salvation: she prohibits the clergy from getting temporal authority. It was the clergy in most ages of the world, though I mean the corrupted only, who were the cause of many bloody persecutions, whenever they possessed sufficient power. Notwithstanding the several importunate petitions for established churches, America, since her independency, never suffered the clergy to grasp her empyrean sceptre of freedom, and whose shores have not been contaminated with the blood of martyrs. Since, all direct means to the establishment of political religion have proved abortive; but now, Americans open your eyes! another policy, under the cloak of a brotherhood, is at work; a National Synod is in view! A majority of all the clergy, of all denominations, with their good reputation, their wealth, their learning, centred in a National Synod, their influence in society would be unparalleled. All they need is a general understanding, a common interest, with amalgamated influence, to suborn the populace to send such representatives to Congress subsidiary to their long premeditated scheme; the Constitution might then be rejected, America enslaved, the bloody flag of persecution hoisted—and they, like temporal lords, reigning in the plenitude of power. The clergy in Europe, at an early day, were humble servants of Christ; but how soon, when they drew their cords close together, whole countries were overwhelmed in one promiscuous ruin, and drenched with blood! O, America, thou sceptred queen of the world, thou patroness of liberty, look to ruined Europe, and take warning! O, free born Americans, be watchful over our blessed constitution, lest it may be undermined before ye are

aware of it. It is not enough that we have it—we must also preserve it. Happy will it be for America, if the different denominations remain externally divided, whilst the union of all believers remains of a more invisible nature. Blessed will her climes be, as long as their temporal interests clash; peaceably will her citizens dwell under the fruitful boughs of her towering tree of liberty, whilst the clergy are not supported by civil authority; whilst they are maintained by the gratitude of their people, and venerated as the meritorious messengers of the most High.

O, Americans! the best means of preserving our liberty, is to cultivate the holy religion of Jesus, which is full of truth, justice and mercy. Infuse its principles into the minds of the rising generation; then our extensive empire may blossom like the rose—produce new heroic Washingtons and philosophic Jeffersons; ages upon ages will unfold new splendors; whilst bloody tyrants cause Europe to groan under oppression, with countries desolated, with fields smoking with human blood and gore, with cities wrapt in fire, and incessant woes filling the breasts of crying widows and orphans—a sight at which heaven bleeds and angels drop tears of sympathy. Vice debases a nation, and is the introduction of all the concomitant miseries. Where are now the nations and empires of ancient renown? Where the Assyrian, the Macedonian, the Grecian, the Roman—once so celebrated among mankind, at whose voice the surrounding nations trembled? Alas! are they not precipitated from the clouds of heaven to the abyss of eternal shame and misery, where the ghosts of departed empires stalk about in sad lamentation of their former glory! Their desolation and ruin followed their departure from the path of duty, virtue and honor!

Americans! I cannot conclude without alarming you a little more, that our liberty is endangered. Behold, how many dupes there are—duped by the worldly minded into their secular designs. What numbers have become so lukewarm in their political as well as religious principles, that it becomes a matter of indifference for whom they vote as our representatives on the days of our election. This is the idle song of many: "*It matters not what manner of politics one has imbibed, whether of this or that, if he only means it well; if he can please us with his smiles, his neighborly turns shortly before the day of election, or even with a bowl of grog, he shall have our suffrage.*" O, what a shame for free-born Americans to be like Esau, to sell their birthright for a trifle; to despise so invaluable a legacy of God, our liberty, costing the blood of many of our forefathers! But it seems that liberty can only

be enjoyed by a wise and virtuous people; but dupes and asses cannot live without tyrannical masters!

I add no more, lest I should appear too political for a man in my office. However, I claim no more than citizenship, and the freedom of speech.

The humble servant of the reader.

DAVID HENKEL.

Report

Of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North-Carolina, and adjacent States, held at Buffaloe-creek Church, in Cabarrus county, Trinity, A. D. 1819.

The ministers and deputies from North-Carolina, &c. met, according to the constitution of the Synod, (see Luther, article of the constitution 2d, page 153,) at Buffaloe-creek Church, on Sunday the 6th of June, 1819.

The following members of the Synod met: the Rev. Philip Henkel, from Tennessee, and the Rev. Daniel Moser, from Lincoln county, N. C. ordained ministers; the Rev. David Henkel, from Lincoln county, N. C. and the Rev. Joseph E. Bell, from Tennessee, consecrated candidates; Frederick Hoke, Esq. St. John's Church, Daniel Lutz, Esq. and Peter Hoyle, Esq. School-house Church, Messrs. Jacob Forney, White Haven, Isaac Mauney, Long-creek, George Howis and Adam Kloninger, Philadelphia Church, deputies; Mr. David Thronberg also took a seat among us, as a private friend—all from Lincoln county, N. C.

The president of the last Synod, which was held in 1817, did not attend to his duty, (see Luther, page 155, article 9th constitution.) It was said that the Rev. C. Storck was very sick, at the distance of about two miles from the church; but hoping that his sickness was not unto death, we addressed to him the following letter, and sent it by Peter Hoyle, Esq. and Mr. Ritchie; but when they arrived at the house, he was gone. They pursued, and overtook him going home, and handed him this letter:

Buffaloe-creek Meeting-house, Cabarrus Co. N. C.
Trinity Sunday, June 6th, 1819.

Rev. sir: We, your brothers in Christ, are met at this time and place, according to the constitution and discipline of the Lutheran Synod of N. Carolina, and adjacent states, in order to hold a Synod; but, to our great mortification, no sacra-

ment was appointed by you, the president, according to the constitution of said Synod. We request you to attend, as prescribed by rule. We are strangers, far from home; and according to the constitution and discipline, we design opening Synod. If you will not attend, we must proceed without you; but we pray you to attend, for the sake of the blessed Jesus and his church. We will wait for you till to-morrow 9 o'clock, A. M.

Signed by all the ministers and deputies.

Peter Hoyle, Esq. and Mr. Ritchie, returned to us the following written statement; a true copy of this was delivered to said Storch, and his answer was—"I am indisposed; and if I were not indisposed, I would not attend; for conference is over, and there is none now depending!" He further ordered his elders not to open the doors, and thereby prevent a Synod from being assembled.

Signed, PETER HOYLE, and I. RITCHIE.

We then sought, amongst strangers, an asylum for the evening, which, thank God, we easily procured.

Monday, June 7th.—The ministers and deputies all assembled, as the day before, at the church; and about 9 o'clock, A. M. a number of persons met to hear preaching. The doors being opened, the Rev. J. E. Bell spoke from 1. Corinthians, c. 10, v. 15; and the Rev. David Henkel addressed the audience upon the subject of Antichrist. After preaching, we retired to the shade of the trees, near the church, where, with singing and praying, we opened Synod. The Rev. Philip Henkel was elected President of the Synod, and J. E. Bell Secretary and Treasurer.

The following petitions were read, viz: 1. Petition from four congregations in Tennessee, praying that their minister, J. E. Bell, might be advanced to the highest order of the ministry. 2. Petitions from Granger and Hawkins counties, Ten. praying for ministerial labors in their neighborhood, stating a wish to be supplied by our Synod. 3. Petition from School-house church, Lincoln county, in favor of David Henkel's advancement, and remonstrating against a harsh and illegal decision against said Henkel, at a former illegal meeting, and declaring a final separation if not attended to. 4. Petition from St. John's Church, in substance the same as the 3d. 5. Petition from Philadelphia Church, stating how unfair and unlawful means had been taken to degrade the Rev. David Henkel, at a former illegal assembly; and in other respects the same in substance as the 3d and 4th. 6. Letters from the Rev. Adam Miller and Jacob Zink, were read, excusing their

absence from this Synod. 7. All the deputies produced certificates of their election, and being in full communion with our church, were entitled to a seat and vote. They all prayed, unanimously, that the Rev. David Henkel be advanced; stating that he was a zealous preacher of the gospel, a good citizen, and a moral and a well informed man; and that all the complaints heretofore laid against him, were founded in prejudice, to the best of their knowledge and belief. 8. According to the constitution, the Rev. Joseph E. Bell and the Rev. David Henkel produced their theological treatises, which were highly approved. Then said Bell and Henkel were, by the laying on of hands, and prayer, ordained Bishops (commonly called pastors) of the Christian Church, and received their credentials for the same. 9. The constitution of Union Seminary, in Greene county, Ten. is to be laid before the Rev. Paul Henkel and the Rev. Robert J. Miller, and if they approve the same, it shall be the constitution of the same, and the money collected for it shall be given to it. 10. The Rev. Philip Henkel, or J. E. Bell, or both, will visit the petitioners in Granger and Hawkins counties as often as possible, until the next Synod. 11. The ministers reported that they had baptised and confirmed since the last Synod, as follows:

	Infants.	Adults.	Slaves.	Confirmed.	Buried.
Philip Henkel - -	137	191		105	8
David Henkel - -	383	49	38	135	11
Joseph E. Bell -	105	27	1	147	
Adam Miller - -	146	10		33	10

12. The Synod regrets the inexcusable absence of so many members, requesting them to conform, for the future, to the constitution of the church. 13. The Treasurer is ordered and authorised to have the reports of this Synod printed, and to pay for the same out of the money now in his hands, provided said money is sufficient to do the same.

The Synod was dismissed with prayer.

JOS. E. BELL, *Secretary.*

Answer to the Petitions in favor of David Henkel.

Trinity Sunday, and Monday following, A. D. 1819.

The constitutional Synod, held at Buffaloe-creek Church, Cabarrus county, N. C. took into consideration the case of the Rev. David Henkel and his congregations: First, the decisions against said David Henkel were transacted at a time not according to rule—see Luther, page 153, article 2d, page 156, article 13th—therefore, must be void: Secondly, the above petitions recommending said David Henkel as a zealous

preacher, of good moral behavior, a good neighbor, &c. and nothing appearing to the contrary at the Synod, and as the time and place of the Synod were sufficiently published, we consider it our duty to advance said D. Henkel to the grade of a Pastor, in conformity to the statement in Luther, p. 175. He and the Rev. Joseph E. Bell were ordained by a unanimous vote of the Synod.

PHILIP HENKEL, *President.*

A SHORT DEFENCE IN MY OWN CASE.

Whereas several charges were exhibited against me at the extempore meeting in April,* 1819, which were then tried, and the decision published in the minutes of April; and as many persons are ignorant as to the nature of the case, the following statement relative thereto is made:

The meeting in April was not a lawful Synod, not being convened on a legal time; hence the decisions against me could not be binding on me longer than till the following legal Synod, which was held in June. It is true there has been a rule, adopted in 1817, which authorises the President, with the advice of two ministers, during vacancy, to silence any one until the next Synod—see Luther, page 164. Now had their conviction led them to believe me guilty of the aforesaid charges, they might have silenced me, agreeably to this rule, until the next Synod; but it is to be observed, that they did not silence me. Two days after the trial, they gave me a license extending to the next Synod. The following is a true copy and translation of said license:

"Nomine Jesu. This is to certify, that Mr. David Henkel has been examined agreeably to the order of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerial Assembly of the state of North-Carolina, and adjacent states, with respect to his knowledge of the Evangelical doctrine, and the requisite qualifications to bear the office of an evangelical teacher; in consequence thereof, he is hereby authorised to preach publicly, to catechise, and to baptise, in the congregations of Lincoln county, and in all other vacant congregations of the evangelical church, wherever it may justly be requested, until the next conference. Testified

* Said meeting in April was composed of the Rev. C. Storck, Robert J. Miller, Jacob Sherer, Godfrey Dreher, and C. Shober, ordained ministers; and also of Daniel Moser and Michael Roach, who were then ordained; together with a few candidates, &c.

by us, the officers of said conference, with the signatures of our names, and the ministerial seal affixed, this 30th April, 1819. CHARLES STORCK.

[L. S.] G. SHOBER, *Sec'y.*

The original of this license I yet have in my possession. From it, it is evident that they fully acquitted me of every charge, or at least they acquitted me of all criminality. The license says that they had examined me, and found me to possess the requisite qualifications to bear the office of the ministry, and in consequence thereof authorised. Moreover, they also offered me a letter of recommendation—see minutes of the April meeting, page 12, sec. 21. Notwithstanding, I am published in said minutes as having acted rash, &c. Yet, for all that, it seems I was qualified for the ministry, and entitled to a letter of recommendation. From this the reader may learn, that the meeting of April did not deem the charges alleged against me so criminal as to silence me; otherwise they would, or ought to have done so. Being thus declared, in the aforesaid license, to possess the requisite qualifications for the ministry, and a letter of recommendation proposed to be given me by the ministers who composed the April meeting, hence there was nothing to prevent my ordination by the legal Synod in June following.

But I am blamed for not applying to Mr. Storck, at the expiration of six months, for a candidate license, &c. I answer, that I had no need to apply for any, when I was legally ordained a pastor on Trinity. The license I received from them only extended to the next conference, (or Synod,) which appears from its contents, although their minutes say for six months, see page 12; or that they had thus resolved that my license should extend six months. Here is a contradiction. Agreeably to which should I have acted? Agreeably to the license which only extended to the next Synod, or agreeably to the minutes, which say that it extends for six months? It is evident that I could not have acted agreeably to both. Mr. Shober is, perhaps, ready to plead errors; but who is to know which he means to be an error—the license he signed, or the minutes he had printed? What makes this case still more doubtful, is, that he has since declared, in his minutes of 1820, "that I received a license as catechet for one year," see page 5. Thus he gives three different statements of my license: 1st, in the minutes of April, "for six months;" 2d, in the license itself, "until the next conference;" and 3d, in his last minutes, "for one year." But whereas, a catechet or candidate has no other authority to show for his administrations but only his license—who can blame me for having acted agreea-

bly to my license. My license only extended to the next Synod: the next Synod was held on Trinity following. Now had I acted as a catechet after my license had expired, I would have acted for some length of time without any authority. It was therefore necessary for me to be authorised anew, in some manner, at the legal Synod on Trinity, or else to have acted for a while without authority. What man of common sense can blame me for not acting without authority? The members of the April meeting unanimously agreed, that the decisions of a call-Synod should remain valid until the succeeding Synod. The following are the words of their resolution, extracted from their minutes. This resolution was formed at the very commencement of their session. Their minutes say, page 5, sec. 2, "It was further unanimously acceded to, that our reverend president, with the consent of two or three ordained ministers residing in his vicinity, is authorised to call a Synod, and to make other orders and regulations which will not admit of delay, and which should be valid until the succeeding meeting of the Synod." Now the license they gave me was exactly in conformity to this resolution, viz: to be valid until the succeeding Synod. I acted agreeably to my license and this resolution, by them unanimously adopted. But it is a great pity that they did not act agreeably to this their own resolution themselves. The April meeting was only a call-Synod—but Trinity a legal one. Instead that they, agreeably to their own resolution, should have owned their transactions to be valid until the succeeding meeting of the Synod, they endeavored to enforce their decisions upon the church as synodical and lawful, for a longer term than to the meeting of the next Synod, in open violation to the constitution, and contrary to their own resolution. None of them, except the Rev. D. Moser, ever showed themselves at the legal Synod on Trinity, to give a legal account of their transactions.

The most of the charges exhibited against me in April, were since published in the papers; hence, for the satisfaction of my congregations, and other friends, a committee of investigation were appointed to examine said charges. They formed answers to every charge. The following is the verdict of said committee, extracted from their report: "We, the subscribers, constituting a committee, being jointly assembled from our several congregations, in Lincolnton, in order to investigate the charges alleged against the Rev. David Henkel; and after examining respectable witnesses, who have accurate knowledge of these things, we Report, that it would be no interest nor credit to us to uphold a wicked man; but as long as we find

no greater fault with Mr. D. Henkel than hitherto, we can by no means think of dismissing him as our pastor. We are satisfied. With respect to the censure in the publication against the Rev. Paul Henkel, David's father, we reply, Where is the parent that would not inquire into the affair of his child when evil reports are exhibited? And would not any parent rejoice to find such reports contradicted in the very neighborhood where they were first exhibited? The Rev. Paul Henkel was so informed by persons of credit. But we cannot add much to the general reputation of Paul Henkel by our vindication, as his standing in society and merits are too well known, for a great number of years, in many parts of our Union."

Jacob Forney, Henry Rudisail, junior, John D. Abernathy, Peter Stamy, Jacob Cloninger, Jacob Aderhold, Isaac Mauney, Jacob Plonk, John Dotters, George Seller, Peter Hoke, David Thronbergh, John Smith, Christopher Siegman, Adam Keiser.

Lincolnton, N. C. July 18*th*, 1820.

"We, the subscribers, constituting select councils for the purpose of examining the report of the committee of investigation, who had met in Lincolnton on the 18th of July, for the purpose of investigating the charges exhibited against the Rev. David Henkel, declare, that we have examined said report, and do highly approve the same. And from the just respectability we entertain of the persons who constituted said committee, we have no doubt but they examined all the charges impartially, agreeably to the testimonies of respectable witnesses. We acquiesce in their verdict. It is also our opinion, that there are no just grounds why the Rev. David Henkel should not be respected as a worthy pastor of the church. All the charges exhibited against him have not in the least lessened his good reputation, in our view."

Abraham Forney, Philip Young, M. B. Garner, Michael Cloninger, John Leinberger, Frederick Kilion, John Sifford, Andrew Derr, Gottlieb Helderman, Moses Abernathy, Alex. M'Corkle, Wm. Rader, Jacob Keener, Jacob Summit, of Lebanon, July 23d, 1820; John Abernathy, Wm. Robinson, Peter Edleman, Alexander Reid, Christian Heaker, John V. Cannon, William Beal, Wm. Hager, Miles D. Abernathy, of White Haven, July 30th, 1820; George Howis, Lewis Clemmer, Frederick Howis, David Cloninger, Michael Rein, Lewis Thronberg, Jonathan Thronberg, Christian Best, Jacob Best, Lewis Leinberger, Frederick Leinberger, sen. of Philadelphia, August 6th, 1820; John Moeney, John Boehm, Frederick Carpenter, of Beaver-Dam, August 16th, 1820; Daniel Grose, Anthony Shitel, Adam Segel, Peter Michael, Peter Vian,

Peter Sane, Daniel Lutz, Esq. John Rudeseel, Jacob Haast, Samuel Yount, Jacob Probst, Jacob Reinhart, Daniel Segel, Daniel Michael, Henry Hoke, John Segel, of School-House, August 19th, 1820; Peter Little, Esq. George Smith, Joseph Isenhower, Henry Stein, Christian Sammet, Philip Hetrick, Daniel Bowman, Henry Yount, John Isenhower, sen. John Stein, sen. John Miller, Henry Gross, John Moser, Henry Dejenhart, Daniel Hoke, Anthony Moose, Lewis Hafer, jun. Frederick Hoke, Esq. of St. John's, August 14th, 1820.

I must observe, that it is my private opinion that my accuser would not have gone to the extent he did in opposing me, had he not been wrongly informed in several instances, and had things not been misrepresented. I have also reasons to believe that some others endeavored to fan the fires of contention. But whether he would wilfully wrong me, or any other man, I leave to God and to his own conscience to judge. I positively declare, (although he may differ from me in his religious sentiments,) that I entertain no private animosity against his person, nor do I wish that any of my friends should. Many of his relations and family connexions are respectable people, and a goodly number are friends to us both. Neither have I any hatred against any of his friends, in consequence of our contest. Several, and perhaps all, of the committee and councils who subscribed the above verdict in my favor, are friends to him as well as to me; nor have they subscribed their names to it with a view to injure his reputation. The reasons I have for thinking so are, because they, in a general way, were opposed to all harsh measures. I am much obliged to the committee and the councils, for their christian and benevolent advice.

DAVID HENKEL.

Reasons

Shown why the Rev. Charles Storck, Robert J. Miller, Gottlieb Shober, Godfrey Dreher, and Jacob Sherer, full ordained Ministers, who composed the meeting of April, 1819, and all such as they then and since ordained, and their candidates and catechets, and such other ministers who since stand connected with them, cease to be a regular Lutheran Synod of this and the adjacent states; and why my father, brother Philip, and myself, refused to join in with them on Trinity, 1820, at Lincolnton.

It is not my intention to notice all the sneers and frivolities of individuals, but to show to the Lutheran community wherein the aforesaid ministers have departed from some of the rules and doctrines of the church. Indeed, there are some of

this connexion who have not departed as far as others; but as they belong to one body, they are partakers of one common cause. The Rev. Joseph E. Bell is certainly a very great exception to any of the rest, both as it respects his talents and conduct. But O, eloquent Bell! it was thy misfortune to join this connexion. Hadst thou known things and persons properly, perhaps thou wouldst not have taken this step.

The following sections will give a general view of their deviation from the rules and doctrines of the church, &c.

1. Breach of the constitution in 1819. It must, at first view, be evident to all orderly and decent persons, that no well regulated church can be preserved as such, without adhering to certain Christian rules, founded upon a just constitution. What would be the result in a state, provided a majority of representatives could do as they pleased, without submitting to a constitution, or deviate from it whenever they saw proper? The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of this and the adjacent states had adopted a constitution, and which was legally amended in 1817, when translated into the English language. Said constitution wisely specified the time and place of the meeting of the Synod, viz: "Annually on Trinity Sunday, in rotation of counties." This, indeed, was a wise arrangement to prevent designing men from assembling in a clandestine manner, at an improper time and place, when they might obtain a favorite point which they knew they could not in a full Synod. The succeeding Synod after the year 1817, was appointed to meet according to rule, on Trinity, 1819. But contrary to rule, the meeting in April was called, not merely for the purpose of consulting on things which would not admit of delay, and then to appear at the legal Synod, either to have their decisions approved or rejected: instead of that, they imposed their transactions as synodical upon the church, and published those to be stubborn who did not attend at their meeting. The Rev. Philip Henkel requested them by letters, which were received and read in April, to meet on Trinity following, as prescribed by rule; also stating that he had received no timely nor official notice of their premature meeting. Had he even been informed, yet they had no legal authority to require his presence, since the very ends they assign for their premature meeting are as unconstitutional as the time of meeting itself. The reasons assigned for meeting sooner than the legal time, were, because they wished to send a deputy to Baltimore to meet the Synod of Pennsylvania, who assembled on Trinity in order to establish a General Synod. But, in the first place, it must be observed, that the plan they proposed and adopted for

a General Synod is contrary to the seventh article of the Augsburgh Confession of Faith, as is sufficiently demonstrated in the preceding oration. Neither could they establish a General Synod, on the aforesaid plan, without altering and amending the constitution, as it does no where authorise the Synod to adopt any such thing. The constitution, inasmuch as it makes the Augsburgh Confession of Faith the point of union, is expressly against said plan. The constitution cannot be altered nor amended, unless two-thirds of all the ministers and deputies agree: See Luther, page 156. No two-thirds ever altered or amended it since 1817, for there was no lawful Synod appointed until Trinity, 1819. Thus it will be seen, that they did not only violate the constitution in meeting too soon, but also in adopting a plan unauthorised by the constitution, and repugnant to the seventh article of the Augsburgh Confession of Faith.

Provided the plan of the establishment of a General Synod had been so laudable an undertaking, why did they not defer it until the meeting of the legal Synod, and suffer it to be openly investigated agreeably to rule? Why this illegal, premature step in a good cause? Would it have been impossible for North-Carolina ever, at any other time, to have got into the connexion of a General Synod with Pennsylvania, but only on Trinity, 1819? Since when has North-Carolina become so deplorably dependent on Pennsylvania, that she must break her own constitution to get into connexion? It seems she must do evil, that good may come! Is it not a wonder that they did not first obtain the consent of all the ministers and congregations, in so great an alteration? Now if their intentions were good, as they declare, why did they not meet on the regular time, and give satisfaction of their conduct, especially when Philip Henkel informed them that he had no timely nor official notice of their meeting? They did not all go to Baltimore....none but one. Is it reasonable to think that he, as also the candidates of Tennessee, should lose their votes, and obey what the others would, without their knowledge or consent, arbitrarily impose upon them? It is also to be observed, that they, of Tennessee, were not all who were not present in April; others were absent, as well as they. The offence of breaking the constitution may, at first view, seem a light matter; but it was mutually agreed upon—it served as a mutual promise, or as a truce: now if the breaking or disregarding of a promise, or truce, or the falsifying of one's word, is not considered criminal, then we need to make no distinction between truth and falsehood, and fidelity and treachery.

2. The constitution denied by their president, Charles Storck, and their secretary, G. Shober, in 1820, at Lincolnton, N. C. The Rev. Joseph E. Bell, my father, my brother Philip Henkel, myself, and our deputies, were willing to govern and be governed by the regular established constitution. Thus we were willing to be censured legally, provided it should have been proved that we had acted improperly. But the Rev. Storck and Shober denied that we had a ratified constitution. That they did so, cannot only be proved by a crowd of witnesses, but Mr. Shober also owns it in their minutes of 1820. Was it reasonable that we should have been governed without a constitution? Should we have suffered them to have judged us without a law, and they not be judged at all? The Pope only, in former times, judged, but refused to be judged; for none dared say to him, what dost thou? But what may be the reason that these two men, who, in regard to their age, deserve to be respected, had to shelter themselves under so barefaced an assertion, in denying that we had a ratified constitution? Most melancholy circumstance! Aged fathers, soon retiring to the silent mansions of the dead, must yet, when their course is nearly finished, justify a misconduct at the very peril of truth! Why did they deny the constitution? They well knew that they had violated it in 1819; that we were about to bring them to an account for it; that, agreeably to it, their transactions in April would be declared void. Now, rather than to submit to law and justice, like humble and God-fearing men, they grasped the last desperate means, which was the denying of the constitution, and an attempt to accomplish their ends by a majority without a law, or by a lawless majority. In what manner is it possible to excuse them? Could they have forgotten that they had a constitution? Can they plead this? (*a*) Is it possible that Mr. Shober could have forgotten it, when he had compiled it—when he certified with the signature of his name, in the preface of said book, that the Synod, in 1817, had adopted it—when he mentions the names

(*a*) The case of the Rev. C. Storck is extremely pitiful. He was a man of good standing, highly venerated, and very popular. But being aged, full of bodily infirmities, which, in the nature of things, have a tendency to impair his mind, and also being pertinaciously influenced by a subtile individual, all this may have led him astray, and may measurably, in the eye of charity, extenuate his misconduct. The Rev. Robert J. Miller was not present on Monday, when the constitution was denied: but afterwards he made Shober acknowledge his error. But did said Miller also insist (as some of the deputies did) that the illegal transactions in April, 1819, should be recalled, and every one be tried by the constitution, after it was owned? No. Had he, his conduct would be highly applauded. What did it signify to own a constitution, and not to act agreeably to it?

of the committee who examined it—when he calls it a constitution—when he had 1500 copies printed—when he sold it as such—and when people bought it under that impression? Was it not the constitution, then it was a forged book by himself, which he imposed upon the community: but was it, (which, beyond all dispute, it was,) is it not shocking that he could have the face to deny it! But were Storck and Shober only culpable? No. The others were silent when the constitution was denied. They elected said Storck and Shober as their officers the very same day; and, under them, a pretended Synod was opened. A Synod having officers denying the constitution—a Synod without a law—a lawless caucus! What man of prudence, who wishes to support a good character, would associate with a lawless club? What man of common sense would suffer himself to be judged by the lawless? Had we united with them in this situation, we should have rendered ourselves ridiculous in the sight of all lovers of rule and order.

But this assembly, some time after the constitution was denied, owned it again; yet they never recalled the former illegal transactions of April, 1819. They were so far from it, that they proposed to ratify said transactions. (See their minutes of 1820, page 11, sec. 12.) By this they wish their transactions to wear the aspect in the eye of the public, as if now they were lawful. But the very proposition they adopted to ratify them anew, proves that they were unlawful. Had their transactions before been lawful, what need was there to ratify them again? Lawful things need no new ratification, because they are lawful in themselves. How can wrong things be made right by a ratification? A ratification of wrong things is the same as persisting in a wrong. Or, indeed, can wrong be right? Thus they must have ratified wrong things, as right ones do not need it. What may have been the reason that Storck and Shober were not silenced for their misconduct, when the Rev. J. P. Franklow was silenced in April, 1819, for six months, for no greater fault, and perhaps not as great?

3. This connexion deviating from the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, with respect to the Lord's Supper.

The most of denominations have certain creeds, agreeably to which their ministers are to teach, and by which they are distinguished. The Lutheran church is distinguished from others, in her peculiar doctrines with respect to the sacraments and the person of Christ. This church, also, has all along recognised the Augsburgh Confession of Faith, and Luther's Catechism. Lutherans, when they are confirmed as members of the church, asseverate that they believe the doctrines they

were taught, agreeably to Luther's Catechism: and when a minister is ordained, though confirmed before, yet he also vows obedience to the Augsburgh Confession of Faith. Why are men called Lutherans? Is it not because they believe the doctrines Luther taught? No one, I hope, thus denominates himself because he trusts in Luther the same as in Christ; but because he has learnt his doctrines from him; hence because he is his scholar. Now how can such be Luther's scholars who deny his doctrines? If any one teaches contrary to what Luther did, he cannot be his scholar, but rather his teacher.

The presence of the real body and blood of Christ in the Lord's supper, is professedly the doctrine of the Lutheran church. But this body of men do not teach this doctrine as Luther did, nor according to the Augsburgh Confession of Faith; which is not only evident from various testimonies, but also from their answer to Mr. J. Hill. (See their minutes of 1820, page 18.) They say there, "We do not believe, nor teach, that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is corporeally received along with bread and wine in the Lord's supper." The word *corporeal*, signifies the having of a body: the corporeal body of Christ, or the body of Christ, having a body! Wonderful expression! There is no body in the universe unless it be corporeal: if it were not, it could not be a body. Even a spiritual body is corporeal—that is, it is a body. Why did this connexion not express themselves grammatically? Why this unpardonable tautology? "We do not receive the body," &c. "corporeally:" or, the body bodily—or, the body as having a body!!! Were there no scholars among them? There certainly were. If the body and blood of Christ are at all received, they must be received corporeally; because there is no body, &c. unless it be corporeal—that is, there can be no body unless it be a body. It is evident that they mean the real body and blood of Christ are not received in the holy Eucharist. This is still plainer from their subsequent expression, when they say, viz: "But the true believer does spiritually receive and partake of the same through faith in Jesus Christ, and all the saving benefits of his death and passion." Agreeably to this, his body and blood are not really present and administered, because they admit no other partaking than a spiritual one by faith. The unbeliever, therefore, does not become guilty of the body and blood of the Lord by receiving them in unbelief: in short, he receives nothing but bread and wine.

I will now compare this, their doctrine, with the Augsburgh

Confession of Faith, and Dr. Luther's own declarations, in his catechism and elsewhere, in regard to this subject. It is not my intention to dispute with other denominations, (in this section,) who always have differed from the Lutheran church on this point; but merely to show that this connexion, who call themselves Lutherans, do not believe the Lutheran doctrine. The tenth article of the Augsburgh Confession of Faith, positively says: "Of the Lord's supper, we teach thus, That the body and blood of Christ are there really present, and administered under the external signs of bread and wine." (*b*) If Christ's body, &c. be really present and administered, it must be a real (not an imaginary) body, &c. That which is not corporeal, is not a real body nor blood. Now if the body and blood of Christ are *really* present and administered, how can the sentiments of these men be agreeable to this article, when they deny that the body and blood of Christ are corporeally received—especially as the term corporeal is the same as bodily? The article says, "The body and blood of Christ are administered," &c. It does not say administered to the true believer only, but simply administered. Lest any person should think that my comment on this article should be wrong, I shall here translate Dr. Luther's own words from the German, as he undoubtedly must have understood the true meaning of the Augsburgh Confession of Faith better than any man in modern times, when it was penned by his coadjutor Melanchton, and examined, approved, and subscribed by himself. The following are his own words, taken from his larger catechism: "What is the sacrament of the altar? Answer: It is the true body and blood of Christ in and with bread and wine, commanded by Christ's word, for us christians to eat and to drink." Immediately after, he says: "The word, I say, is that which makes and distinguishes the sacrament, that it is

(*b*) This article is quoted from the English translation, in the book called Luther, by Mr. Shober; but the original German is more emphatical. The literal translation is as follows: "Of the supper of the Lord, it is also taught, that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, under the figure of bread and wine, in the Lord's supper, and which are administered and received: Wherefore, the contrary doctrine is rejected." I must also observe, that Luther frequently calls bread the body of Christ, &c. which might lead some to think that he taught a change of the elements; yet he denies this. But the reason is obvious; he taught that the Lord's body is connected with the bread, &c.; hence, for this reason only, he sometimes calls it the Lord's body. That this is the case, is evident from various passages of his works. Neither did he teach, as some of the vulgar blasphemously represent, that Christ's body and blood were received in a gross, carnal manner, and devoured by pieces, like the eating of other meat, &c. Although it is taught that Christ's real body and blood are eaten and drank with the mouth, yet every communicant receives his whole body and all his blood, inconceivable by human reason, and divinely mysterious. This is Luther's doctrine.

not merely bread and wine, but that it is, and is called, Christ's body and blood. With this word, thou mayest strengthen thy conscience, and say, if an hundred thousand devils, together with all fanatics, bluster out, how can bread and wine be Christ's body and blood? Yet I know that all spirits and scholars in one crowd, are not as wise as the Divine Majesty in his little finger. Here are Christ's words: 'Take, eat, this is my body; drink ye all of it, this is the New Testament in my blood," &c. Further he saith: "If even a boy receives or administers the sacrament, yet he receives the proper sacrament, that is, Christ's body and blood, as well as he that treats it in the most worthy manner, inasmuch as it is not founded upon human holiness, but upon the word of God. And as no holy one upon earth, yea, no angel in heaven, can cause bread and wine to become Christ's body and blood, therefore no one can alter nor destroy it, notwithstanding it be abused. For the sake of the person or unbelief, the word by which it became a sacrament, and by which it was instituted, is not falsified. He doth not say, if ye believe, or if ye be worthy, ye have my body and blood, but take, eat and drink, this is my body and blood. Moreover, this do, (viz. what I now do, institute, give unto you, and command to receive,) that is as much as to say, you may be worthy or unworthy, you have here his body and blood, by virtue of these words which are added to bread and wine. Such notice and retain well, for upon these words all our foundation, fortress and defence are built, against all errors and delusions which ever came, or yet may come." Thus far Luther's larger catechism. In his book Wittenberg, fol. 243, he says: "Whereas, I see that heresies and delusions increase, the longer, the more, and the raging of Satan does not cease. Lest none may henceforth whilst I live, or after my death in future, prostitute me and my writings to strengthen their errors, as the fanatics of the sacrament and baptism already do, I shall therefore, with this instrument of writing, confess, before God and the world, my faith, from subject to subject, to which I intend to adhere until death....(God help me to depart from this world, and to appear before the judgment seat of Christ.) And lest any person, after my death, should say, "if Doctor Luther was yet alive, he would teach and hold this or that article otherwise, as he had not sufficiently studied it: against this I now protest as then, and then as now, that, through the grace of God, I have studied all these articles, and diligently compared them, again and again, with the Scriptures, and would certainly defend them." Then immediately he saith: "Through the grace of God, I have learnt to know a great share of Satan. If he can misrepresent and confuse the

word of God, what should he not do with mine, or any other's words?" Further he saith: "I count them all in one cake, that is, as sacramentarians and fanatics, which also they are who will not believe that the Lord's bread in the Lord's Supper is his real, natural [*human*] body, whom the wicked, or Judas, receives with his mouth, as well as St. Peter, and all saints. Who will not believe this, (I say,) may let me alone, and hope by no means any fellowship with me." Thus far Luther. I also refer the reader to the Church History of Milner, abridged by Townsend, page 710, 711. He will find there, that Luther invariably maintained the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, and refused brotherly fellowship with those who denied it.

Thus it will be seen, that the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, is not an invention of my own, nor a novel doctrine, as has been represented heretofore. Should any one think that Luther was wrong, let him openly declare it, and forsake the Lutheran church, and join such as are of his opinion. It is no disgrace to be called a Calvinist or Methodist, &c. as there are honorable men who are thus denominated. No one would be despised by men of reason if he were to do so, provided his conscience did not suffer him to believe Luther's doctrine. But is it not a miserable thing, that this connexion of ministers, deny Luther's doctrine, and yet endeavor to cover themselves with his cloak? As it respects myself and my associates, we consider our vows too sacred to break in fellowshipping this connexion, who deny the very doctrine Lutherans vow to maintain, especially as we are not convinced that it is unscriptural. Were we convinced by the scriptures that it was wrong, we should not think it wrong, nor hesitate to renounce it and the Lutheran church.

4. My ordination defended upon legal grounds; and, also, upon the concessions of my opponents, in receiving the Rev. Jos. E. Bell without a re-ordination.

Being assailed in various respects, my ordination also has not escaped. A man who preaches and administers the sacraments without a proper authority, must be an impostor, and all persons receiving him knowingly are partakers of his guilt. Now should I not be lawfully authorised to exercise the office of a pastor, (or bishop,) then I certainly would be an impostor, and the people who receive me a horde of ignorant dupes, or disorderly persons. But should I undeniably prove that I am legally ordained, what must one think of those who report that I am not? Not only for my own sake, but also for the sake of my well beloved, judicious, and respectable congregations, who cordially receive my administrations, not because they

are duped, but they recognise my legal authority, I am constrained to make this defence.

I was not ordained when a mere novice; but I had been a probationer ever since the Synod which was held in 1813, when I received a license; and besides that, I was licensed some considerable length of time before, by three ministers. At every Synod held until I was ordained a pastor, I was declared qualified for the office of the ministry, and authorised. Ever since the year 1815, I was authorised to administer the rite of confirmation and the Lord's supper; and, in 1816, I was consecrated, by the laying on of hands, for the same purpose—(See minutes of 1815, 1816, and 1817.) Thus I had preached upwards of seven years to the date of my ordination; authorised at two sessions of the Synod to act as catechet, and at three to administer all the ordinances; and at the extempore meeting in April, 1819, notwithstanding all the charges exhibited against me, I was still declared sufficiently qualified for the ministry, &c. I will leave it to the reader, whether a man who is upon trial (nearly, or quite) seven years, should not either be advanced or else dismissed. I must, indeed, be a very complicated character, that I could not be found out, in seven years' time, whether I deserved an ordination, or to be finally dismissed! My ordination was not performed in a private manner, nor at an improper time; but when and where the constitution had directed. Were there any charges against me, why did those who had them not attend at the legal Synod, and allege them? The time was sufficiently published, not only by letters, but also by the constitution. If any of the members of the April meeting were against my being ordained, why did they not attend at the Synod as they were requested? They then could have had a seat and vote: hence, if they could have produced sufficient reasons, they might have prevented my ordination. Why did they not? It is in vain for them to say, that, because the ordination was performed by one man, (the Rev. Philip Henkel,) that, therefore, it must be unlawful. Philip Henkel did not perform it upon his own authority, but by the consent and solicitation of the Synod, as he was directed by rule. Of all persons, the members of the April meeting and their associates ought to say the very least about the lawfulness of any thing, when they did not only violate the law, but when their officers also denied that they had a ratified constitution. It must be out of the question to talk about legal or illegal transactions, when there is no law. And if their doctrine be true, which has been preached up by some of them, that, "in extraordinary cases, deviations from rules or constitution are often necessary and profitable," (see their

last minutes,) why should not Philip Henkel be allowed to preach the same, when he performed ordination? If even this groundless assertion were true, that he had acted unlawfully, yet he would (agreeably to their argument) not have committed any wrong, "as it is sometimes necessary and profitable to deviate from rule or constitution." Can they plead this? why should he not be allowed to do the same? Is it reasonable that he should be bound to act lawfully, and the others have the privilege to deviate from the rules or constitution when they please? How can they prove by the constitution, that if an individual minister, when authorised by the Synod, performs ordination, that he acts unlawfully? They cannot, especially since they adopted the following resolution, at Lincolnton, (1820,) that "It was unanimously resolved, that, *hereafter*, no ordination for the ministry in our church shall be performed, nor declared to be valid, except it is done by at least two ordained ministers of our church, and by such who were thereto appointed by the Synod." (See their minutes, page 10.) Now if the constitution had before prohibited any individual minister from performing the rite of ordination, what need had they to adopt a rule, that *hereafter* no ordination should be performed except by at least two ministers? By this they prove that individual ministers before were never prohibited from performing ordination. Or, indeed, is it necessary to make two rules exactly alike to answer one end?

I shall also prove by their own concessions, in receiving the Rev. J. E. Bell without a re-ordination, that they have no just reasons to say aught against my ordination. If they received Mr. Bell as a regular ordained minister, then they must have recognised the transactions of the legal Synod held on Trinity, 1819, as legal: if so, how could they persist in their illegal transaction of April? But did they receive him as an unlawful minister, then they fellowship a disorderly man—they have a rotten member; hence, upon this ground, they must be a disorderly connexion of men, because they fellowship an unlawful, disorderly minister. They say, "It was admitted that he was ordained, but that his ordination was invalid according to the rules of all regular christian churches. His ordination was unanimously made legal, valid, and ratified." (Last minutes, see page 10.) An invalid ordination is no ordination. There can be no ordination unless it be performed by a proper authority. Was his ordination not performed by a proper authority, then he is not ordained at all. How then could they make that which was no ordination at all a valid ordination? But was he ordained by a proper authority, how could they say that it was invalid? Was it valid and legal, how could

they ratify and make it legal? Can a legal thing be made legal? Was his ordination unlawful, invalid, and wrong, how could they make an unlawful thing lawful, an invalid thing valid, and a wrong thing right? Can wrong be right? Why did they not re-ordain (or properly ordain) him, before they received him? But perhaps they mean, (and some have said it,) that, though Mr. Bell was not ordained according to the rules of all regular churches, yet he was ordained according to the scriptures, as we have examples upon divine record that individuals ordained others. What a pitiful subterfuge! Is it not ridiculous to think, that the rules of regular christian churches should be contrary to the scriptures, and that the scriptures should allow of such ordinations which the rules of regular churches condemn? Such churches whose rules condemn a scriptural ordination, cannot be sound orthodox churches: they must certainly be daughters of the old harlot of Rome! If Mr. Bell's ordination be scriptural, which they must admit, (or else admit that he is not ordained at all,) then it certainly must be valid; for if a scriptural thing is not valid, then there is nothing valid. How then could they make it valid? or, indeed, are the holy scriptures to be made valid by a connexion of men? Is Mr. Bell ordained according to the scriptures, so am I, as we were both ordained together, at one time and place, and by the same person. (*a*)

But upon the whole, if Mr. Bell's and my ordination were not lawful, then Philip Henkel would certainly be guilty of a great misdemeanor in his office, in performing such an unlawful act. Now if they had been convinced that Philip Henkel had acted arbitrarily and illegally, why did they not silence him, or at least bring him to an account for it? But they were so far from doing it, that they sent two messengers in order to make a compromise with him, and receive him as brother. What, offer a man a compromise who is guilty of so great a misdemeanor? It would have been in his place to have done

(*a*) It is generally said, that a regular ordination must come through a proper channel. My ordination is derived through two channels from Europe. The first is through the Rev. Dr. Frank, professor of theology in the university of Halle, in Saxony; and the other is through the Rev. Velthusen. Dr. Muhlenberg, Kuntze, &c. were ordained by Dr. Frank. These two, with Dr. Smith of Philadelphia, ordained my reverend father. Mr. Velthusen ordained the Rev. C. Storck and Nussman; Storck and my father ordained my brother, (Philip Henkel,) and he me. Dr. Frank was born the 27th day of March, A. D. 1663, at Lubeck, and died at Halle in the year 1727. Frank was the founder of the orphan-house at Halle, and many other valuable institutions. He successfully prepared many persons for the ministry, and supplied many parts of Europe with ministers, and has also sent some to India, in Asia. See Buchanan's Researches.

it. Or did they wish to have another unruly man in their connexion? (*a*)

5. The question, "Who are, and who compose, the regular Lutheran Synod of North-Carolina and adjacent states? and who are, in the eye of the constitution, unregular?" briefly considered.

Before this can clearly be answered, it will be necessary to ask, What is a Synod? A Synod is a body of ministers, with lay deputies, who superintend the concerns of the church under their care, agreeably to certain christian rules, founded upon a constitution. But a body of ministers, &c. who act without a constitution, can be no regular Synod: they are the builders of Babylon. Neither are a majority to act contrary to the constitution; nor can such decisions be made legal because a majority say so, as some people vainly dream. The very intention of a constitution is, to be a check upon the majority; otherwise, if the majority could act as they list, a constitution would be useless, as the majority would then be the constitution. If a majority act contrary to the constitution, it becomes the duty of the minority to coerce them to obedience; and if they refuse, they cease to be of that body, and the minority only then compose the body—because they had not departed from the constitution, their supreme law, and the truce to which they all agreed.

The connexion I have been describing have departed from the constitution, which the preceding remarks undeniably evince. In short, their departure from the constitution, &c. may be comprised in the following heads: 1. A two-fold breach of the constitution in 1819. First: meeting at an improper time, and that, too, without letting some of the ministers in Tennessee know it, until it was too late for them to attend; and others did not get to know it until their meeting was over. Secondly: sanctioning a plan which is contrary to the

(*a*) It appears that the Rev. Philip Henkel did compromise with them: but he has since declared himself as not belonging to their connexion; nor do any of the congregations in Tennessee own their ministers as regular Lutherans. Now why said Philip Henkel compromised with them, and afterwards declared it void, he is requested to inform the Lutheran community in an official manner, at our meeting of the next Synod. He has informed some individuals of this county by letters. Whether the compromise he made with them was not fairly stated to him, or whether, at that time, he had not all the necessary information with respect to certain circumstances, is left for him to explain. It was, indeed, apparently a political step to compromise with him: by this means they could have divided us, and strengthened their cause. I must yet observe, that his compromise with them was only in an individual capacity: he had no synodal authority for doing it: hence it is, upon that ground, that it is void, and of no effect; especially as he compromised before they recalled their illegal transactions. This, indeed, showed his good will, which is commendable, but not always safe, until justice be done.

seventh article of the Augsburgh Confession of Faith, viz. the government of a General Synod. 2. Their officers denying the constitution, and the others fellowshipping them, and thus conniving at their offence. 3. Refusing to recall their former illegal transactions after the constitution was acknowledged, which had been denied by their officers. (*a*) 4. Denying the

(*a*) The reader is to observe, that the constitution was denied on Monday, and afterwards, on the same day, they left the meeting-house, the proper place for holding the Synod, and went into a house of entertainment, where they, under officers who did not own the constitution, transacted business. We then concluded, that, since nothing could be legally transacted with them, we would endeavor to meet in Tennessee, where there were some more of the connexion who had not deviated from rule. The same day, late in the evening, we, with several of our deputies, retired to my dwelling-house, about five miles from Lincolnton. But expecting that my worthy friends, Messrs. John Abernathy, Henry Rudisail, and Jacob Aderhold, deputies from their several congregations, would stay the next day in Lincolnton, to see how this connexion would further proceed, I sent Mr. Jacob Plyer, jun. deputy from Lancaster, S. C. to them in the morning. I sent a few lines by him to Messrs. Abernathy and Aderhold, cautioning them not to take seats with said connexion, whilst they continued in their lawless situation. But I also authorised Mr. Abernathy, in particular, that in case said connexion would own the constitution which was denied the day before, and if they were willing to recall their former illegal transactions, and try every thing anew by the constitution, he should let me know, and I would attend again. Upon this same ground we were willing to act the day before; but thinking that they might weigh the case better until the next day, and to prevent a schism, I proposed this to them by my deputy. We could easily have recalled our resolution of holding a Synod in Tennessee, had they acted constitutionally. Messrs. Abernathy and Aderhold promptly attended to the directions I had given them by my letters. The following is a part of an instrument of writing written by Mr. Aderhold, which fully explains the nature of the case: "To the Lutheran community of this and the adjacent states, and all who love the truth: Mr. John Abernathy made a motion, which was seconded by myself, which was—That whereas the session in April, 1819, was contrary to the constitution; hence all transactions of that session, not being of a binding nature, should be recalled. But this was rejected. Mr. Abernathy then said, Well, then, acknowledge Mr. David Henkel's ordination, for you have ratified Mr. Bell's, which stands upon the same ground, being performed at the same time and place, and by the same person, the Rev. Philip Henkel, agreeably to the constitution. The Secretary then replied, There is a great difference between the two, for there are some charges against David Henkel. Well, said Mr. Abernathy, if there are, then try him according to the constitution, for any charges against him since the last Synod. This request was also rejected by the officers, and did not suffer it to be debated. The candid reader may see that justice was not intended towards the minority. Had they acted impartially, they would have taken up Mr. Abernathy's motion, or at least taken the yeas and nays. And had they had any charges against Mr. David Henkel which they could have proven, they would not have refused to give him a trial. But they said he was not there, that they could not try him. Mr. Abernathy then replied, If they would admit his ordination, which was constitutional, and that he had a letter with him from Mr. D. Henkel, stating, that if they would act upon constitutional principles, he should let him know, and he would attend. But, No! was the answer: we have nothing to do with him. Yet, it appears, that was not so; as they afterwards took up more degrading questions against him, and in their minutes censure him as having behaved with conspicuous incivility on Monday before. But the President and Secretary denying a

doctrine of the Lutheran church, with respect to the Lord's Supper. ☞To this also may be added, that one of their officers at the meeting in April, 1819, declared that he could not believe what was read there, viz. "*that the manhood of Christ was taken up* (not changed) *into his Godhead; that, therefore, he possessed all divine perfections.*" But when an appeal was made to the Bible for proof, he said, "If five hundred bibles would say so, I do not believe it!!" I never have learnt that he was publicly nor privately censured by his associates, although several of them well knew it. The officer who spoke in this manner was not the Secretary, but their President.

Whereas this connexion would not act constitutionally, and all the other ministers present, who were not criminal in the same degree, associated with them; it was out of the question with us to have any thing to do with them whilst they continued lawless. We three, therefore, and deputies, having the constitution on our side, had to act the best for ourselves and those under our care. We had legal authority to alter or amend the constitution, if two-thirds of us agreed, being a regular body, assembled at a proper time and place, for the purpose of holding a Synod. Allowing one deputy-vote for one minister, there were six votes in all; now had four out of six agreed to alter and amend the constitution, it would have been legal; but we generally agreed to do so.

The following is a statement of the regular synodal transactions for the year 1820, by the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North-Carolina and adjacent states:

known truth, (I mean that we had a ratified constitution,) in the face of the whole audience, which, with their unconstitutional transactions in 1819, and departing from the Lutheran doctrine, was the cause of all the confusion that took place on Monday. For which conduct, Mr. David Henkel, with his father and brother, upbraided them. Now reader, which do you think is most conspicuously uncivil, the denying of a known truth, to the mortification of others, by the heads of a Synod professing the holy religion of Christ, or else upbraiding them for their conduct, and appealing for a fair investigation of his own and his opponents' conduct? This may suffice for an illiterate man, such as I am. JACOB ADERHOLD.

"*February* 12*th*, 1821."

It was not my intention only to be tried legally, but also to try them upon the same principle. Now why did they not accept the proposal, which my deputies made, to try me constitutionally? This is sufficient to show, that I did not retire home on Monday evening with a view to be screened from a legal trial, otherwise I certainly would not have challenged them the very next day, through my deputies, to try me, and be tried by the constitution. What signified their owning a denied constitution, when they would not try others and be tried by it? Had they accepted the proposal, and tried me, and could they have found me legally guilty of my supposed crimes, the sentence of excommunication would have had some weight with men of sense; but so it bursted in the air.

"It was resolved, that whereas the most of the ministers who live in this and some of the adjacent states, who were members of this Synod, had departed from the constitution, &c. and even their officers denying it, so that they must needs cease to be regular members; that the Synod now begun should finish their transactions on the 17th and following days of July next, in one of the churches in Greene county, Tennessee; and then and there, with the advice of Mr. Zink, and Adam Miller, who reside in that state, to make such alterations and amendments as should be deemed necessary in the new local situation of the Synod."

According to this agreement, the Rev. Philip Henkel, who had been the President of the preceding Synod, appointed the Synod to assemble in Solomon's Church, Cove Creek, Greene county, Tennessee, on the aforesaid time. Agreeably to appointment, the following ministers met: The Rev. Jacob Zink, from Washington county, Virginia; Paul Henkel, from New Market, Virginia; Adam Miller, from Sullivan county, Tennessee; Philip Henkel and George Esterly, from Greene county, Tennessee. David Henkel, residing in Lincoln county, N. C. belonging to this Synod, could not be present.

☞ The Rev. Lewis Markert, who always had been a regular member of the Synod, lives now in the state of Indiana. He was not present at two or three Synods, (or perhaps more,) which is, no doubt, owing to the great distance from the places of meeting. He has not taken any part (to the best of our knowledge) with the illegal connexion, nor have they registered his name with theirs in their minutes; hence he is still a member of the regular Synod.

Besides the aforesaid ministers, there were also nineteen deputies from nine congregations, who met. The Synod continued their session from the 17th to the 19th of July. Their principal transactions, alterations, &c. are as follows:

1. It was resolved, that the Rev. Jacob Zink and Adam Miller, (who for a goodly number of years had been candidates,) should be ordained Pastors, (or Bishops,) which was also done by the laying on of hands and prayer.

2. Resolved, that Mr. George Esterly should be ordained to the office of Deacon, in the congregation at the Golden Spring, Greene county, Tennessee, on the ensuing Friday, which was also done.

3. Upon the petition of many of our members residing in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, by Messrs. George Clemmer and John Smith, it was Resolved, that the Rev. Jacob Zink should visit them.

Rules and Alterations. 1. It was deemed expedient, that

the transactions of this Synod should be in the German language;* and the reports thereof should also be published in it.

2. All doctrines taught by us, both with respect to faith and conduct, and all books for public use in the church, shall be in conformity to the holy Scriptures and the Augsburgh Confession of Faith, as near as possible. Luther's smaller catechism shall be the standard catechism of our church; agreeably to which our youth, and others who may need it, shall be instructed. The Christian Catechism, printed at New-Market, Shenandoah county, Va. may also be used in the explanation thereof.

3. No one can become a minister, or any other officer of our church, unless he be first received as a regular member by the congregation, according to the order of the church, and leads a christian life. All such as desire to become ministers, must solemnly promise to teach agreeably to the word of God, and the Augsburgh Confession of Faith, and the doctrine of our church. Neither can it be suffered, that any minister of

* The reason of this is, because there is no minister belonging to this Synod who is not a master of the German tongue, and there are some who understand the English very imperfectly. But this article is not to be understood that our English brethren are to be neglected, or any of their privileges curtailed: deputies sent from English congregations are not to lose their votes, because they do not understand the German tongue. It will be an easy matter to interpret every motion made to them. Neither does the article say that no English should be spoken at all in the Synod, but simply that the transactions should be in German, which does not exclude the English. Nor are they prohibited from having the reports of the Synod printed in English, of which this is a specimen. Provision may always be made hereafter, in this case, if English ministers wish to associate with us. The reason why we wish to preserve the knowledge of the German language is not because we are too selfish to patronize another tongue—all such as are acquainted with us know it—but because the most of our theological books are written in the German, which contain our doctrines. Luther was a German, and the most of his works are only extant in that language. They never were translated into the English tongue; and if they were to be, they would lose much of their original beauty, which is the case in the most of translations. If the knowledge of the German language be lost, the peculiar doctrines of our church will also be forgotten, in another generation, provided there be no accurate translations. There are many of our English brothers and sisters who owe their knowledge of the Lutheran doctrine to German authors. They rejoice that they do know it, and it has proved a great consolation to them in many of their mental distresses. Had there been no person who understood the German tongue to explain it to them in English, they would still be destitute of the valuable comforts they confess that they enjoy: hence it will be an interest to them and their children if the German tongue be preserved, so long, at least, until those valuable authors can be translated. Unbiassed, liberal minds among my English brethren, concur with me in this sentiment, and would freely learn the German, if they were not too far advanced in life, and had the means; and they justly explode those young Germans who have German-speaking parents, and do not learn their mother tongue, in consequence of a false modesty; and feel ashamed to spring from a nation of people who were known before the birth of our Saviour, and has produced the greatest men of valor and of science.

our Synod should be connected with the General Synod, if it should ever be established as it has been proposed.

4. No one can be a member of our church, unless he or she has been baptized according to the command of our Saviour, and confirmed by the laying on of hands, and commune.

5. The grades of our ministry are only two—Pastor and Deacon. A pastor may exercise all ministerial functions; he has general authority. He must be ordained by the laying on of hands and prayer, by one or more other pastors. A deacon does not possess the same authority; he is only to catechise, read sermons, admonish, and, in the absence of the pastor, if requested, to baptize children. He must be examined by the Synod, at the request of the church council, with respct to his qualifications; and if he be found qualified, he is to be consecrated by the laying on of hands and prayer, by one or more pastors, either in the Synod, or else in the congregation whom he is to serve. But if a deacon acquires the necessary qualifications for the office of a pastor, and he receives a regular call from one or more vacant congregations, he may be ordained thereto.

6. At every Synod, certain pastors shall be nominated and appointed for the purpose of performing ordinations, and to subscribe the credentials attested with their seals, and to keep good order. They shall also subscribe their names to the other transactions of the Synod, and if it be requested for certain reasons, all the other pastors and deputies may do the same. If it be deemed necessary by the Synod, one of the pastors may be appointed to act as a president, to read, to make proposals, &c.; and another one may also serve as Secretary. But it is not to be understood, that such are to act in this manner during the whole session: others may be appointed to change places, just so as the circumstances may require it.

7. It was resolved, that annually there shall be a Synod held, commencing on the third Sunday in October, in the state of Tennessee, or in the western parts of Virginia, at such place as the majority of ministers and deputies shall appoint. But should it be deemed necessary that the Synod should be held in any of the adjoining states, it may be allowed; yet it shall always (for the future) be called "*Tennessee Synod.*"

8. The Synod is to consist of ministers and deputies, as usual.

9. Every congregation is to keep a treasury for itself, supported by free donations, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the printing of the minutes of the Synod, of missionaries, and other contingent expenses of the congregation. The manner of supporting the treasury, and of expending the money, shall be left to the church council and minister. But

at every Synod the church council shall give an account of the moneys they received, &c. A treasury for the Synod, at this time, is not deemed necessary.

10. Every minister is to keep a register of the number he baptizes, confirms, &c. as usual.

11. No minister of our Synod shall be allowed to take a seat and vote with the connexion (*who call themselves the Synod*) of ministers in North-Carolina, until we are convinced that they are united with us, in the evangelical doctrine of the Lutheran church.

12. It was deemed expedient that these resolutions should remain as they are stated, and all transactions to be in conformity to them; yet should it, at any future Synod, be considered necessary to make amendments, it may be done by a majority of votes—but not so as to alter the intention of the above.

13. It appeared to be the wish of all present, that, annually, one of the senior ministers should visit all the congregations of our connexion, and to examine into their situation, to edify young ministers with salutary instructions and admonitions. All that were present declared themselves willing to make some preparations that it might be done.

14. The next Synod is to be held in Sullivan county, Tennessee, in one of the Rev. Adam Miller's congregations, commencing on the third Sunday in October, 1821. The name of the church and place where it shall be, shall be published before that time.

15. It was also resolved, that the objections which some of the ministers of the state of Ohio alleged against the plan-proposals for a General Synod, should be printed with the minutes. [☞The Oration which the reader may find in the commencement of this little work, supplies the place of the objections the Ohio ministers alleged. They contain no other arguments. The oration was nearly finished, before I got to see them....AUTHOR.]

16. At the conclusion of the Synod, the Rev. Jacob Zink preached a lengthy and most excellent sermon, from the second epistle of St. John, v. 9, 10, and 11.

The Rev. Andrew Henkel, living in the state of Ohio, being a member of this Synod, does not attend in consequence of the great distance. He is now also a member of the Synod of Ohio, and my father likewise. In this way we are connected with that venerable body, consisting, by this time, upwards of 30 or 40 ministers; however, their exact number I do not know, as I have not seen their latest minutes. My father, also, is now 37 or 38 years a member of the Synod of Penn-

sylvania. In this view, we are also connected with that Synod. But whether he will continue to be a member of that venerable body, will depend upon this, whether they will persist in adopting the plan for a General Synod which they proposed; or, in other words, whether they continue to be a regular Lutheran Synod. I have charity to believe, that there is a goodly number among them who will not depart from sound doctrine and the Lutheran church discipline. In this place it may not be improper to make an observation, which was forgotten to be made in my oration, viz: Individual Synods being established for the preservation of good discipline; but should any treat an individual unjustly, through partiality and envy, he then could have an opportunity to attach himself to another Synod. But should he be justly excommunicated for crimes sufficiently testified, no other honest Synod would dare to receive him. Thus there is an opportunity for the innocent to find redress, and the guilty to be discountenanced. But if the General Synod should excommunicate a minister unjustly, where then shall he find redress? Such a one, not willing to suffer unjustly, raises a new sect of his own: hence this is the very reason why there have been so many schisms among such denominations as are governed by general Synods. But when all denominations are to form a National Synod, such individuals as were unjustly excommunicated would have but a slender opportunity to establish parties; and if they did, the national church, like that of Rome, might persecute them in a very feeling manner. Then farewell liberty, forever!

6. The doctrine of the Lutheran church with respect to the Lord's supper, (sometimes called the holy Eucharist,) briefly vindicated against several cavils and misrepresentations.

Whereas, the doctrine of our church, with respect to the Lord's supper, is much disputed, and assailed in various ways; and some of our brethren being much perplexed in consequence thereof; and as I, also, lately have been the same as challenged to defend it, I shall not stop to lay my arguments before the public. But I shall not think of ridiculing others in an unbecoming manner, who differ from me in sentiments.

Statement of the Controversy—(Status Controversiæ.)

Before I proceed, it will be necessary to let the reader know more particularly wherein the controversy consists. The question in dispute is, "Whether the real body of Christ, which was crucified, and his real blood, are present in the Lord's supper, and administered, not only to believers, but also to unbelievers?" The opponents to the Lutherans say NO—but we say YES. There are two classes of opponents, expressing them-

selves differently, yet their sentiments upon the whole are nearly alike. The first declare, that they do not believe the presence of the Lord's body and blood in the holy Eucharist, but that bread and wine are representations or emblems of Christ's broken body and shed blood, and memorials of his sufferings and death: that the words, "Take, eat, this is my body; drink, this is my blood"—are not to be understood in a literal sense, but figuratively, viz: Take, eat, these are emblems of my body and blood. The second admit that the true believer may eat and drink Christ's body and blood spiritually by faith, or all the benefits of his death and passion. Hence they do not believe the real presence of his body, &c. upon earth, but that their faith is awakened by the external elements, the same as by the word of God when it is preached, ascending with their mind to heaven, and there eat and drink his body and blood by faith, the same as they eat and drink bread and wine with their mouths.

The words of institution, examined in what sense they are to be taken, and illustrated by those of St. Paul, I. Cor. c. 10, v. 15, 16. We would know nothing of this institution, had it not been revealed to us by Christ. The light of nature could not have revealed it. This is not an institution of some prophet, nor of an angel, but of the Son of God: it is a divine mystery. And as none could reveal it but Christ, so no one can with propriety argue from any other source upon the subject, but alone from the words he spake, and such as have been spoken by his inspired servants. In the night in which he was betrayed he instituted it, with the following words, viz. "*And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body: And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins.*" St. Matthew, c. 26, v. 26, 27, 28. See St. Mark, c. 14, v. 22, 24. St. Luke, c. 22, v. 19, 20, saith the same words, only with the addition, "*This do in remembrance of me.*" These words appear very plain in themselves; and if they were not differently construed from what they are expressed, no person that believed the scriptures could ever thought of denying that the real body and blood of our Lord were present and administered in the supper. But no doubt, because it appeared unreasonable to some, or rather far beyond reason, to admit that a body could be omnipresent, they sought a method of explaining these words, so that they might comprehend this holy mystery with reason: hence they proposed that these words should be understood figuratively, viz: "Take, eat, this bread

signifies or represents my body, &c. or an emblem of my body, &c." Several seeming reasons are advanced to justify this explanation. It is said that it is a very customary thing for the inspired penmen to speak in a figurative manner*; that is to say, the literal meaning of a word is frequently lost; and that the same word is employed to signify another—for instance, at the institution of circumcision and the passover: of circumcision it was said by the Lord, "*This is my covenant*" —Gen. 17, v. 10; that is, it signifies my covenant; as the cutting of the foreskin was not the covenant itself, hence it only could signify it, although it be called the Lord's covenant: and of the passover it is said, "*It is the Lord's passover*"—Exod. 12, 11. Now the paschal lamb which the Israelites did eat in the passover, was not the passover itself, though it be called so; hence it only signifies it. Thus some conclude, that the words of the institution, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c. ought to be explained in the same manner, i. e. figuratively, "it signifies my body," &c.

This is the argument of some of our opponents, to prove that the words of the institution ought to be understood figuratively, and that the Lord's body and blood are not present. I do by no means deny but what there are many figurative expressions in the bible, as well as in other books, which all, who are acquainted with the rules of rhetorick, will readily admit. But what then, if there be? Will this prove that, because there are some metaphorical expressions in the bible, that therefore the words of our Saviour in the institution of the holy Eucharist must also be such? An odd conclusion! As if a man would say, there are some rocks in his field, that, therefore, there must also be rocks in his garden. But even

* We do not deny the use of tropes, or of figurative language, and even admit that such might have been used in the words of institution; but such metaphors, &c. as are designed to destroy the real benefit of this sacrament, could not have been employed by our Saviour. Let us suppose a certain landlord were to invite a certain number of people to dine with him, he would set before them a number of empty dishes, and say, here, eat, these are good victuals. This, indeed, would be a metaphor; and the literal meaning would be, "These dishes are only to represent victuals." Would such a landlord not render himself ridiculous in the sight of his guests? But should he set the dishes filled with good victuals before them, and say, pointing to the dishes, "here, eat, these are good victuals," he would also use a metaphor, in calling the dishes victuals, (as dishes are no victuals:) but how widely different from the first! Our Saviour could not say, Take, eat this bread, and drink this wine, and call them his body and blood, when he only gave these elements unconnected with any thing else. This, indeed, would have been a metaphor, and such a one, too, like the one described, the landlord calling his empty dishes victuals. How much more becoming is it to the dignity and goodness of our Lord, to suppose that he would have employed such a metaphor as would import the gift of something which his communicants never had before; hence not mere empty bread and wine, or emblems unconnected!

admitting the words of the institution to be figurative, in the same way as those of circumcision and the passover, will it then prove that the Lord's body and blood are not really administered in the Eucharist? There is, indeed, it might be confessed, some propriety in comparing the manner of institution of the sacraments of the New Testament with those of the old, as those of the new are in lieu of them; and upon this ground, our opponents have room to advance all the arguments they can from the institutions of circumcision and the passover. But I must reply, that the external act of circumcision was not an emblem of God's covenant, but an effectual seal thereof, or a sign under which his covenant was actually concealed; hence it was intimately connected with the external act of cutting the foreskin; as it is said, Rom. c. 4, v. 11, "*And he* [Abraham] *received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness* of the faith which he had*," &c. Circumcision is here called a seal of the righteousness of faith, hence not an emblem of righteousness. What righteousness was it that was sealed to Abraham? That which he apprehended by faith in the covenant, sealed by circumcision. It is an evident case, that every seal must be connected with the thing it is to seal. If a letter be sealed, or any other instrument of writing, the seal must be impressed, and is not separated from the thing it is to seal: a seal, therefore, cannot be unconnected. I have proved that the Apostle calls circumcision a seal of the righteousness which Abraham obtained by faith through the covenant; and as a seal is always connected with the thing it is to seal, therefore circumcision was intimately connected with God's covenant; hence it is called his covenant. Now if the words, "Take, eat, this is my body; drink, this is my blood," are to be explained in the same manner as the words of the institution of circumcision, then certainly it must be wrong to say, This bread represents my body, &c. but, This bread is a seal of my body, &c. by which it is sealed to the communicant the same as circumcision sealed the covenant. A seal being inseparably connected with the thing it seals, hence bread, &c. must be connected with Christ's body, &c. because it seals it:

* If circumcision, which was before the birth of Christ, was called a seal, how much more do the sacraments of the New Testament deserve to be called divine seals. A seal is generally put to some instrument of writing of great importance, and guarantees the stipulations made therein. A divine seal, (or a sacrament,) does not only seal God's grace to the recipient, but also renews and strengthens the heart within; which is evident from II. Cor. 1, 21, 22—"Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also *sealed* us, and given the earnest of the spirit in our hearts." Hence, to seal is the same as to stablish, anoint, or to bestow his spirit more abundantly.

and, therefore, upon this ground, the Lord's body and blood must really be present in the holy Eucharist.

With respect to the second instance, "It is the Lord's passover," it is similar to that of circumcision. The eating of the *paschal lamb* did not only signify the passover, but it actually was that which effected the passover, it being a mean to prevent the first born of the Israelites from being slain, as were those of the Egyptians. See Exod. c. 12, v. 12, 13. Hence, when it was a mean to effect so great a blessing, then it could not be a mere emblem; therefore neither can the Lord's supper, because it is admitted that it is to be explained in the same manner. There are many more expressions in the bible similar to these, not to be taken literally, that if we explain the words of the sacrament accordingly, it will amount to the very same—that bread is connected with the Lord's body, and the cup with his blood. For instance, "*The spirit of God descending like a dove*," Math. 3, 16, which was seen at Jordan. With bodily eyes the holy spirit cannot be seen; neither was the form of a dove the holy spirit himself—because God, as God, has no shape, and is to be likened to neither a dove nor any thing else. This plainly shows, that this passage is not literal. But is it either rational or scriptural to suppose that this was a mere emblem of the holy spirit which came upon our Saviour? Could a mere emblem, unconnected with any thing else, "anoint our Saviour with the oil of gladness above his fellows?" Heb. 1, 9. No. Hence the holy spirit must have been connected with the form of a dove; whereby he revealed himself, in like manner as God did in former times in a burning bush to Moses, and to Israel in a cloud by day and in a pillar of fire by night. "*Behold the Lamb of God!*" John, c. 1, v. 29. The body, &c. of Christ, could only be beheld, which is called a lamb, because it was to be slain as a sacrifice, the same as lambs were under the law. But had Christ a body, or a human nature only? No; he also is God. His Godhead is intimately connected with his manhood; for "*the word was made flesh*," v. 14; hence, "behold the lamb of God," implies the whole Saviour, God-man. Notwithstanding this expression not being literal, yet it would be absurd to say that it meant that Christ's manhood was only a token or an emblem of the lamb of God!! This would make our Saviour a mere effigy, which would be a blasphemous conclusion. Now admitting the argument of my opponents, (upon which they lay their greatest stress,) that the words of the sacrament should be taken figuratively, even agreeably to the instances of figurative expressions which have been produced, I have proved

that the Lord's body and blood must be connected with the elements.

That the words of the institution imply that the Lord's body and blood are connected with the elements, is confirmed the more when the words of St. Paul, I. Cor. 10, v. 15, 16, are investigated. He saith, "*I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?*"* What does the word communion signify? Answer: A fellowship, or a union of two or more things. What has communion or fellowship with the Lord's body and blood? Some, no doubt, would be ready to say, the true believer. I do not deny but what he has; but the communion of which the apostle speaks in the words quoted here, is not betwixt Christ and the believer, but between bread and his body, and the cup and his blood. It is said, "The cup which we bless, not the believer which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, not the believer which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" But perhaps my opponents wish to have these words to read, "The cup is a token or an emblem of the communion of the blood of Christ," &c. But why must a word be added of men's own invention? The term "token," or "emblem," does not once occur in the New Testament, in the description of the Lord's Supper. If it be allowed to add words which are neither in the text nor context, then it would be an easy thing to pervert the plainest evidence. I might, with equal propriety, explain (or rather pervert) I. John, c. 5, v. 20—"*This* (Jesus Christ) *is the true God*," in the same manner, and say, Christ is only

* From these words it is evident, that not only the cup and bread which our Lord gave to his disciples in the night in which he was betrayed were the communion of his blood and body, but also the bread which was broken, &c. and yet shall be to the end of time. The Lord's supper was delivered to the Corinthian church after our Lord's ascension, and yet the cup they blessed was the communion of the blood, &c. I shall illustrate this by translating the following words of St. Chrysostom, who was ordained Bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 389. "Christ himself," says he, "prepares this table, and doth bless it; for no man can make the bread and wine presented there Christ's body and blood, but he who was crucified for us. The words being spoken by the minister's lips, yet through the power and grace of God, by the word, when he saith, 'This is my body,' &c. the elements in the sacrament are blessed. Like the words which were once spoken, '*Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth,*" are always efficacious in nature, that she grows and multiplies, so are these words, once spoken, efficacious until now, and until his coming again; and effect that in the sacrament of the church, his true body and blood are present." Luther was not the first who taught the bodily presence of the Lord, but here we have an example of its being taught by the ancient fathers; and likewise, the Greek church has taught it, a long time before Luther was born.

a token or an emblem of God. But what man, unless he be an Arian heretic, would suppose that Christ was only a token of God? But should this only mean a spiritual communion, i. e. that Christ's spirit had communion with the sacrament, as the other class of my opponents imagine, then the cup could not have communion with the blood of Christ, but with the spirit of Christ; and the bread could not have communion with the body of Christ, but again with the spirit of Christ. How ridiculous would it be to say, The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the *spirit* of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the *spirit* of Christ? Has Christ two spirits, so that one has communion with the cup, and the other with bread? And since when is a body to be called a spirit? And likewise, since when is blood to be called spirit, i. e. Christ's Godhead? Body and blood no where denote Christ's divinity, but his humanity. In order to evade the force of this argument, that bread has communion with his body, &c. some have, in former times, explained the body of Christ, in this passage, not to be his real, but his mystic body—that is, the Church. But how can this be, when the Apostle mentions his mystic body in the next verse?—"*For we being many, are one bread and one body.*" Should the Apostle make an unreasonable tautology, to mention the very same over again which he had described already? If the term *body*, in the first mentioned passage, is to signify his mystic body, the Church, what then is the term *blood*, which is connected with *body*, to signify? Or, indeed, has Christ two churches, so that the one is called body and the other blood? What a ridiculous conclusion this would be! The Apostle does not say, "We being many, are one bread and one body, and one wine and one blood!"

These words also show, that the Lord's Supper does not only consist of one kind of substance, but of two—bread and wine as the earthly, and the Lord's body and blood as the heavenly. This is also one reason why Lutherans call it the *real* body and blood, in order to be distinguished from the Papists, who teach transubstantiation, and from others who teach a substituted body, or emblem, or representation; for an emblem is in the room of a real thing. The Papists teach, that bread and wine in consecration lose their natural substance, and change into Christ; hence this is called transubstantiation. Therefore, it cannot be the real body and blood, but a newly created body and blood, formed of bread and wine—for as much as Christ's body and blood are always the same, and cannot be formed anew at every sacrament. If the elements changed into Christ, they could have no communion with his

body and blood, as it requires two things to make a communion. It would be ridiculous to say, that the self-same thing should have communion with itself. Now as transubstantiation is a vain dream, it must follow that the Papists only imagine it to be so; and as they deny two substances to be in the sacrament, consequently bread and wine would be an imaginary body and blood, or substitutes for the real. Some of our opponents also deny that there are two substances in the sacrament; for they say that the elements are emblems or representations of Christ's body and blood. If we ask them whether all bread and wine are emblems of his body and blood, the same as that in the Eucharist, they would answer no: for if they did not, they would make the sacrament no more than a common thing. What, then, makes bread and wine emblems, when it must be confessed that common bread and wine are not such? It must be answered, the consecration, or the setting apart from a common to a holy use: hence bread and wine must also undergo a change; and what is this a whit behind transubstantiation? When the elements change into emblems of Christ, it is complete transubstantiation, only in a different dress from that of the Papists. The Papists imagine that the elements change into Christ; yet it is only an imagination of theirs: they have only an imaginary, or substitute, Christ. My opponents do not believe that they change into Christ; but by consecration they become emblems of Christ, or a substitute body and blood. All protestants who are opposed to transubstantiation, declare it to be a superstitious idolatry. Why so? It could be no idolatry if the elements did change into the real body and blood of Christ; for it is no sin, but a duty, to worship Christ. But transubstantiation is idolatry, not because it is Christ, but because it is considered as such, when it is not, but something in his stead. Is transubstantiation idolatry because it is substituted for Christ, then emblems, representations, or images, must be idolatry for the very same reason, for they are also substitutes of Christ. But is it not contrary to God's word, to make emblems or images? "*Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath,*" &c. Exod. c. 20, v. 4, 5. Is it not astonishing, that many Christians who affect to be enemies to all image worship, themselves argue that bread and wine are emblems of the Lord's body and blood, which they eat and drink with great veneration.* But it is to be remembered, that idolatry,

* There is a great difference between emblems, and the types in the Old Testament. Emblems in the New are substitutes of a real Saviour, who is in existence; but types showed one to come, who was not. Emblems now are

or the making of any likeness of any thing, will debar such souls who are addicted to it from eternal salvation. But on supposition it were no idolatry, would the breaking of bread and the cup be fit emblems to represent the broken body and shed blood of Christ? Broken bread cannot represent a broken body. Christ's body, indeed, was bruised and wounded, and in this manner broken; but by no means broken into pieces, like bread is broken, for not a bone was broken in him; (see John, c. 19, v. 36;) hence the breaking of bread cannot represent the breaking of his body. Jesus broke the bread in order to use it, so that each of his disciples might receive a portion. Neither can wine be a fit emblem to represent the shedding of his blood. His body was pierced, and from the wounds his blood flowed. But bread is not pierced, so that wine gushes from it, like the blood did from our Saviour's body: hence bread and wine, viewed in this light, cannot represent his sufferings and death.†

The words, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you," examined.

The cup is not only the communion of the blood of Christ, but it is also the "*New Testament in his blood.*" What does the word *testament* signify? Answer—the last will of a person concerning his estate after his death. A will conveys real property: an emblem, or a token, is only a representation of property, but conveys none. What would it profit, if a father would give images or tokens of his property to his children? This would not be giving them property, therefore it could not be a testament. Now if the Lord's Supper only consisted of emblems, it would be false to call it a testament, because that is no emblem, but a conveying of property. Christ calls it "the cup of the *New Testament* in his blood." A new tes-

likenesses of things that are; but types were no emblems or likenesses of any thing that was, but showed things to come. Should we now have types, it would prove that the Saviour was yet to come.

† Lutherans do not suppose that the Lord's Supper is his body and blood, but only when it is administered to, and received by, the communicant, agreeably to the divine command. Otherwise, when the elements are not distributed, they are simply such, without any other import. The giving and the taking of the elements according to the words, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c. is what makes the sum and substance of this sacrament. But if the elements were to change into Christ, or into emblems of Christ, they would be such still after the celebration, as well as before; hence it would be criminal to eat and drink them in a common way, or let them be destroyed. What could be more idolatrous and superstitious, than to esteem those elements in such a manner as to preserve them, lest they be destroyed or misused? The doctrine of Lutherans is far removed from all such superstition; because they teach no change of the elements, neither into Christ nor into emblems or tokens of Christ; but simply, when administered, his body and blood are received, by virtue of the command which is added, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c.

tament must convey new property, otherwise it could not be new; hence types and shadows can find no place here, because they were already appointed under the Mosaic dispensation, and were properties of the old testament, and all pointed to the substance of the new, which is the Lord's humanity. The old testament was also dedicated with blood, but not with such precious blood as that of the new.* "*Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood: for when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves, and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you,*" &c.—Heb. 9, v. 18, 20. See Exod. c. 24, v. 8. This was typical of the New Testament, hence of the blood of Jesus. See Heb. 9, 8, 14. The blood of animals could not be a type of the spirit of Christ, for his spirit, or divinity, is from eternity, (see John, c. 1.) hence could not be typified. There can be no type where the substance is present. His divinity was present, but his human blood was not then in existence, hence it could be typified. Now as the blood of animals was sprinkled upon the book of the old testament, and that being a type of the blood of Jesus, so now is his blood in the cup of the sacrament. He doth not say, "This cup is the new testament in my spirit," as his spirit was nothing new, for the Israelites partook of it already in the wilderness—I. Cor. chap. 10; but he saith in his blood, which was

* The word "testament," in the original Greek, *diatheke*, also signifies a covenant. Perhaps this expression is borrowed from some oriental custom. History informs us, that it was a very ancient custom among the monarchs of the east, to enter into covenants with each other, which was done by drinking a cup of wine, in which the covenanting parties put some of their own blood, to show their covenant to be so intimate that even their blood was incorporated with each other. Now if the expression, "The cup of the *new* testament or covenant," be borrowed from such a custom, which is very likely, then it would prove that Christ makes such an intimate covenant with believers that he even puts his blood into the cup for them to drink. It must, therefore, be very criminal to despise such a covenant—Heb. 10, 29. The passover was also a divine institution in the old testament: it was in lieu of the Lord's supper, and annually celebrated on the tenth day of the first month in the year—Exod. 12. But the Lord's supper is not confined to this day, once a year only, but may be celebrated oftener: "*This do ye, as oft as ye drink it,*" &c. I. Cor. 11, 25. The passover consisted of a lamb, which was eat, and the blood thereof was struck upon the two side posts and the upper door post of the houses—Ex. 12, v. 7. They eat unleavened bread, &c. with it. It is also evident, from Luke 22, 17, that there was also a cup used in the passover. Agreeably to this, the passover had, with the paschal lamb, bread and wine, the same as the Lord's supper. The paschal lamb was a type of Jesus Christ: "*For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us*"—I. Cor. 5, 7. The Apostle calls him the passover, because the paschal lamb was a type of him. See Heb. 11. 28. If the lamb in the passover was present, why should not the Lord's body be present in the sacrament, when the lamb was a type of him?

something new. That the Son of God became man, in the fulness of time, was so unprecedentedly new, that angels and archangels gazed with wonder at beholding this mystery. This new thing is given to sinners, in this new testament. Lest any one should mistake this blood for another blood, such as emblematical blood, or even to mistake it for his spirit, he adds, "which is shed for you." That same blood which was shed on Mount Calvary to atone for guilt, is connected with the cup. The same is also said of his body: "This is my body, which is given for you"—Luke 22, 19; given into death, and rose again from the dead; hence his real human body. Wonderful cup, indeed! A cup in the beautiful blood of Jesus, sprinkled therewith; a blood that cleanses from all iniquity; a cup of medicine held to the lips of sick, dying sinners!

The words, "Do this in remembrance of me," considered.

"Take, eat, this is my body; do this in remembrance of me." It is thus expressed by St. Luke, and likewise by St. Paul—I. Cor. 11. Some of my opponents imagine that the Lord's body and blood cannot be present in the sacrament, because it is to be done in remembrance of him; for it is said, if a person is to be remembered, then it is necessary for him to be absent; therefore Christ is absent. And again, it is supposed that the words, "do this in remembrance of me," destroy the force of the former, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c.; so that the whole is to be considered as mere memorials of Christ's sufferings and death. This is the principal fortress on which the opponents ground the most of their arguments. But if this were true, that the Lord's supper could not be received in remembrance if Christ was present, then it would prove that the first sacrament the Lord instituted in the night in which he was betrayed could not have been genuine; because the Lord was not only present, but visibly present. How, then, agreeably to the argument of my opponents, could the Lord's disciples eat and drink the elements in remembrance of him when he was visibly present? The disciples were then commanded to do it at that time, in remembrance of him, as well as afterwards, for as much as the institution was not afterwards to be changed. This, of itself, would be sufficient to show, that the argument of my opponents, "That Christ must be absent if he is to be remembered," must be groundless. I have proved that Christ was visibly present when he gave the supper to his disciples; and yet, at the same time, he said to them, "Do this in remembranae of me." The objection of my opponents would be of some force, provided Christ was to be remembered in the same manner as some

good friend who departed this life, and left some tokens of his love. But if this were the case, it would suppose Christ to be dead. Is he dead? No: he is alive, for evermore: hence it must be out of the question to remember him in the same manner as a deceased friend, unless his resurrection be denied. It is evident, that neither an absent nor a dead Saviour is to be remembered. What manner of remembrance, may it be asked, is it then? There is a remembrance mentioned in the scriptures, which implies a believing or trusting in another help. "O my God, my soul is cast down within me; therefore will I remember thee," &c.—Psalm 42, 6. Why does the Psalmist say he will remember God? Answer: because his soul was cast down within him. But what consolation could it have been to him in his distress to have remembered an absent God? Could a God that was afar off afford him any assistance in his gloomy situation? This shows that the Psalmist trusted in God; hence not in an absent God, but in God who "is a very present help in trouble"—Psalm 46, 1. Thus to remember God in one's distress, is the same as to trust in him. Now as a living Saviour is to be remembered, it is the same as to trust or believe in him. But how can one trust to him when he is afar off? Is it possible to trust to bread and wine? Are we to believe in bread and wine? Are we to eat and drink in remembrance of him, which is the same as to eat and drink trusting in him, when he is not present? What, trust in an absent help? How paradoxical! If we are to do it in remembrance of him, or in faith, which is the same thing, our faith must have a foundation to rest upon. Emblems are no foundation; neither are they an object of faith; hence it is impossible to receive the sacrament in faith, unless an object of faith be therewith connected. The only object of faith is the crucified Jesus; hence, if the sacrament is to be received in faith, he must also be received thereby.

As it respects the other objection, that the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," should destroy the force of the words, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c. so that all should mean mere memorials of Christ's sufferings, &c. I reply, that if our Saviour had intended the latter words should destroy the force of the former, he never would have uttered the former. What man of common sense would make a thing which he intended to destroy at the very same instant? Or can it be imagined that Christ did not know what he was saying, that he would speak a thing in a careless manner, which he would afterwards be compelled to recall? No one can, without blasphemy, say so. Had he meant that the words, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c. should mean the same as a memorial or remem-

brance, why then does he add the words, "Do this in remembrance of me?" How would it read, "Take, eat, this is my body, &c. which is a mere remembrance: Do this in remembrance of me?" What, should one thing be mentioned twice in the same sentence? Can our blessed Saviour be charged with such absurd folly, to express himself in such a ridiculous manner, which even would be exploded in a school-boy? Now if we allow our Saviour to have expressed himself like a man of wisdom, we cannot imagine that he would mean one thing by two different expressions in the same sentence: hence, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c. means one thing; and "Do this in remembrance of me," another. The former words mean what they say; and the latter show in what manner the Lord's body and blood are to be received—in faith, or in remembrance of him. The former mean the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood with the elements, with our mouths; and the latter, the eating and drinking of the same by faith, with our souls. The eating and drinking with our mouths enables our souls to do the same, since body and soul are united, so that when an object of faith is presented to the body, the soul may feed upon it.

The question, "Do not unbelievers, who partake of the sacrament, also eat and drink the Lord's body and blood?" examined.

Whereas, some of my opponents assert, that the true believer eats and drinks the Lord's body and blood by faith in the sacrament, and the unbeliever receives nothing but the elements, and thus cast a mist upon the subject, it will be necessary to examine it. The question is not at all whether the unbeliever is benefited thereby, which the opponents forever confound with it. No man believes that an unbeliever receives Christ by faith, nor that he has eternal life abiding in him: But the question is, whether the Lord's body and blood may not be eat and drank in unbelief, as well as in faith, in the sacrament? If it was impossible to eat and drink his body and blood in unbelief, he would have had no need to command communicants to do it in faith, or in remembrance of him. Where there is no possibility to omit a thing, there is no use to command it. We should by no means be commanded to believe, provided it was impossible for us to disbelieve. It must be granted, that no man's faith can cause the Lord's body and blood to have communion with the elements. If our faith could cause bread and wine to be his body and blood, then it would be as great as himself. Nothing can cause bread and wine to have communion with the Lord's body and blood but the words of his own institution. If unbelief could destroy

the words of our Lord, it would prove that it was stronger than the truth, and cause the truth to be a lie. "For what if some did not believe—shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?"—Rom. c. 3, v. 3. "If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself"—II. Tim. c. 2. v. 13. Can it be supposed that faith can make a thing, or unbelief destroy it? For instance, I preach the gospel to two men, the one a believer and the other an unbeliever: can the one who believes it make it the gospel? was it not that before? or can the other, who does not believe it, cause that it is not the gospel? Perhaps the opponents do not mean that their faith can cause the presence of Christ, but that they are excited by the elements to ascend with their faith into heaven, and there spiritually eat and drink Christ's body and blood. If so, why do they talk about receiving the sacrament in faith, when their object of faith, Christ, is to be apprehended in heaven? Where is it proved that we must ascend to heaven to receive Christ in faith? The apostle affirms the contrary: "Say not in thy heart who shall ascend into heaven, that is to bring Christ down from above; or who shall descend into the deep, that is to bring up Christ again from the dead. But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart," &c.—Rom. x. 6, 8. It is very strange, indeed, that the Lord is not nigh us when we commune; that we must say in our hearts, who shall ascend to heaven! If we are to ascend to heaven with our faith, where it is supposed the manhood of Christ is, what purpose can it answer to receive the elements, as we might do that without them? If I am to receive a thing by faith, it must be such a thing which I cannot comprehend with my reason; for what I know I do not believe: where reason has its limits, there faith has its beginning. Bread and wine we can see; and if they be emblems, we may comprehend them with reason. Now if nothing incomprehensible be connected with them, it is in vain to talk about receiving the sacrament in faith, as there would be no object of faith there. Our faith must have a foundation, whereupon it is to build. Bread and wine, in themselves, are no foundation; yet we must receive them by faith, agreeably to the argument of the opponents. But when the Lord's body and blood are connected with them, there is then a complete foundation, which cannot be destroyed by the unbeliever, though he may abuse it. In short, if the Lord's supper is to be received by faith, the object of faith, the crucified Jesus, must be present and received. Faith must not only build on the spirit of Christ, as that would not be the whole Saviour, but upon the mysterious God-man. It is evident that Judas

Iscariot, who was a traitor, partook of the Lord's supper. St. Luke, c. 22, v. 21, saith, "But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table." The two preceding verses contain the words of the institution: "Take, eat, this is my body," &c.; which plainly shows that Judas was with the other disciples at the table at the same time. See Math. c. 26, v. 24, 26. Mark. c. 14, v. 19, 24. It was administered to the twelve, hence also to Judas: but we find no exception made in the words of institution, when administered to him. Christ did not say, "Take, eat, ye *eleven* that believe, this is my body, &c. but Judas thou shalt eat and drink bread and wine only." Moreover, Christ saith, concerning the cup, "Drink ye all of it"—Math. 26, 27. Judas was there, hence included. "And they all drank of it"—Mark 14, 23. If the eleven received the Lord's body and blood, Judas received the same; but if he did not, it would prove that the eleven did not—for they all received one kind of bread and wine, with the same words, "Take, eat, this is my body," &c. St. Paul saith, I. Cor. 11, v. 27, "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." How could any person be guilty of the Lord's body and blood by receiving the sacrament, if he received nothing but bread and wine? Can the eating and drinking of mere emblems make one guilty of his body and blood? Could the Jews have been charged with the crime of crucifying the Lord of glory, if they only had crucified his emblem, or image? I imagine not. But my opponents say, the unbelievers become guilty of his body and blood because they mingle with the pious, and pretend to be what they are not. But how do they prove it? I know of no proof they can advance: but if they have any, they would do well to let the public know where it is written in the Bible. Their bare assertion is no proof. Yet, if this were the case, that the mingling of the unbelievers among the pious, and the pretending to that which they are not, would make them guilty of the Lord's body and blood, then the attending to public worship, or the being baptized, or even their joining in prayer with the faithful, would equally make them guilty of the Lord's body and blood, because they would in these cases also mingle with the pious, and pretend to what they were not. In short, every act of hypocrisy would make one guilty of the Lord's body and blood. If so, what difference would there then be between the sacrament and other things, such as preaching, praying, &c.? Where do we read, that one becomes guilty of his body and blood but only by receiving the sacrament unworthily? No where, as far as I know. The apostle further saith, v. 29, "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself,* not dis-

* These words terrify a number of people from the Lord's table, as they imagine if they were not fully converted before they approached it, their souls should be ruined. Notwithstanding, it is the opinion of a number of such people, that the Lord's supper is no more than a shadow, or an emblem. How strange, that a shadow can injure a soul! These words are grossly misrepresented. They do not say that an unconverted sinner eats and drinks eternal damnation to his own soul, as they are understood by some. From the 20th, 21st, and 22d verses of this chapter, it is evident that some of the Corinthians were drunk at the time of celebrating the supper; so that they did not know what they were doing; that they made no difference between the eating and drinking of the sacrament and other viands. The Corinthians were accustomed to make feasts at the time of the celebration of the Eucharist; so that some, in the flow of their festivity, got intoxicated; hence the apostle rather reproves their disorderly manner of celebrating it, than their mental qualifications. He uses the adverb "unworthily," instead of the adjective "unworthy." The adjective "unworthy" would show an improper qualification in the minds of the communicants; but the adverb "unworthily" shows the improper, disorderly manner in administering and receiving it in a state of intoxication. They did eat and drink damnation to themselves. What manner of damnation was it? The original Greek has two different words to express "damnation," viz: *krima*, [Latin, *judicium*,] judgment, or a temporal damna-

cerning the Lord's body." This shows it to be criminal not to discern the Lord's body; but it could not be criminal if it were not present, as it would be impossible to discern a thing that was not. An unbeliever might justly plead innocence, if he did not receive the Lord's body and blood. He might say, I could discern nothing but the elements, because I received nothing else. But, on the other hand, he is justly accounted guilty, for he could have dis-

tion; and *kata krima*, [Latin, *condemnacio*,] eternal damnation. The text reads, in Greek, krima.....judgment: they eat and drink judgment to themselves. The German translation reads like the original.....gericht, judgment. This is confirmed the more by the verses which immediately follow, viz. "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world"—v. 30, 32. For what cause were many weak and sickly among them? Answer: Because they received the Lord's body and blood unworthily. Why were the Corinthians judged? Answer: In order that they should be chastised. Why were they chastised? Answer: That they might not be condemned with the world. Who are the world? Answer: Such as reject the means of the gospel. This plainly shows, that the damnation which was inflicted upon them was not to destroy their souls, but to afflict their bodies, in order to bring them to repentance, that they might be saved. God, like a kind father, makes use of the rod of temporal affliction to keep communicants from everlasting destruction. No kind father corrects his child in order to kill it, but to keep it from the gallows. It is beyond all dispute, that the apostle Peter, when he received the Lord's supper in the night in which he was betrayed, was not fully converted to God; and his faith, (if it may be called so,) was in a very imperfect degree. That night, after the supper, he denied our Saviour with an oath. See Math 26, v. 70, 74. That Peter was not then a humble, dependent believer on our Saviour, is evinced from the 35th verse, viz. "Peter said unto him, Though I should die with thee, yet will not I deny thee. Likewise, also, said all the disciples." An exercised believer does not trust to his own strength, as it is here stated with respect to Peter and the other disciples. They all fled from our Saviour. Christ, also, said unto Peter, "And when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren"—Luke 22, v. 32. Now if the disciples, who were in a very imperfect degree of faith, were permitted to receive the Lord's supper, why should not persons at this time be allowed to receive the same, even if they were as weak as Peter, and subject to fall as he was. Christ is still the same merciful Saviour as he was then. He came into the world to seek and to save that which was lost; but had he instituted a sacrament which destroyed men's souls, it could not be true that he came to save the lost. A physician who, knowingly, administered poison to his sick patients, and killed them, would be considered a murderer. What could one think of Christ, if he had instituted a sacrament that would poison sinners' souls, and effect their eternal ruin? Could he then be a merciful Saviour, who came to save sinners? No.....he would be a destroyer! To think or say so, would be a most horrid blasphemy: and yet many people are such blasphemers, and think they mean it well, when they are terrifying others from the Lord's table, by representing it as a dangerous trap! Poor sinners are afraid to approach to a merciful Saviour in the sacrament, for fear their souls should be poisoned. If we ask a number of such, who say they are not fit to commune, whether they believe in Christ, they say yes. What an absurdity! A man who believes in Christ shall be saved: he is entitled to heaven itself; why then should he not also consider himself allowed to commune? What, is the Lord's supper more holy than heaven itself, so that one may be fit to enter into heaven, and yet not be fit to approach to the Lord's supper? If these people believed in Christ, they would commune; but as they do not, they are disobedient to God's institution: a disobedient person is an unbeliever; and he that believeth not shall be damned! Where people were desirous to receive it, and could not have an opportunity, their case would be far different.

cerned the Lord's body had he believed, because he really received it. But there are several objections urged against the unbeliever's eating and drinking the Lord's body and blood, which perplex the unexperienced. It is said by my opponents, if the unbeliever received the Lord's body and blood, that he undoubtedly would have eternal life, as it is said, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day"—John, c. 6, v. 54. What can be proved by this? Is it to prove, that whoso eateth and drinketh Christ's body and blood with bread and wine, should have eternal life? The Lord's supper was not instituted at that time when our Saviour spake these words; hence the objection is groundless. Lutherans admit that there may be an eating and drinking of the Lord's body and blood by faith, in addition to that of eating and drinking with the mouth. At the time our Saviour spake these words, the eating and drinking with the elements was not in vogue; hence people then could only do the same by faith. But if there was not another eating and drinking in the sacrament than by faith, then it would be a useless institution, because that was done before. It is readily admitted, that since the sacrament is instituted, we must eat and drink Christ in two ways: first, with bread and wine with our mouths; and secondly, with our souls in faith; and that the eating with our mouths is to assist our souls; hence, a person who eats and drinks with his soul as well as with his mouth, indeed has eternal life; but this does not prove that every one who eats and drinks with his mouth, should have eternal life, because he may not eat and drink by faith. There is no inconsistency to say, that one may eat and drink of Christ, and yet not be saved, for the want of a constant faith. It is expressly said, that all the Israelites who left Egypt, "Did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them—and that Rock was Christ: But with many of them God was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the wilderness"—I. Cor. 10, v. 3, 5. Were all those Israelites who partook of the same spiritual meat and drink, that is of Christ, believers? If they were, how came it, then, that God was not well pleased with many of them, and that they were overthrown in the wilderness? If they ever had any faith, it was not a constant faith; it was soon shipwrecked. "But with whom was he grieved forty years? Was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in, because of unbelief"—Heb. 3, v. 17, 19. Yet we are informed that they did all eat and drink of the same spiritual meat and drink, that is of Christ. Why were they not saved, if it be true that whosoever eats and drinks of Christ cannot be lost? I have positively proved that the Israelites did partake of Christ, and yet that many were lost because of unbelief. They either did not believe at all, or else if they did, they immediately departed from the faith, and thus had no constant faith. If they did not believe, then it proves that they did eat and drink in unbelief: but if they did believe, it proves that it is possible for a person to fall from faith. It is in vain to endeavor to evade the force of this argument, by saying that the Israelites only partook of Christ typically. What then? It must, if it be typical, correspond with the substance, else it could not have been typical. What they did with the types, we may now do with the substance; hence, for our admonition, it is recorded, verse 6. It is, therefore, not impossible for a person to eat and drink of Christ, and yet be damned afterwards; either because he did not do it in faith, or else because he loses it afterwards. Because many do not believe that Christ is omnipresent with his manhood as well as with his godhead, therefore they deny that his body and blood are administered in the sacrament. It is also a natural consequence, that if his omnipresence be denied, that he cannot be omnipotent. But if we believe the mystery of the incarnation of the Son of God, it cannot be denied that the manhood, in consequence thereof, received all divine perfections. "And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us"—John i. 14. What manner of word is it that was made flesh? Answer: The word that was in the beginning, by whom all things were made; hence the Son of God, be-

gotten of the father from eternity, of the same essence, equal in power and glory, was made flesh. The term *flesh* denotes the manhood of Christ, having a body and a reasonable soul: thus the Son of God was made man, or, "God was manifest in the flesh," &c.—I. Tim. 3, 16. The Son of God is omnipotent, for by him the universe was made: he that is omnipotent must also be omniscient, omnipresent: in short, he must possess, of himself, all divine perfections. This Son of God became man; therefore, this man, who is called Jesus, must likewise possess all divine perfections. God and man are inseparably one mediator, so that there is no Son of God, unless he is in this man, and this man cannot be without this God. In this man "dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily"—Col. 2, 9. Is God almighty, so is this man, because an almighty God is dwelling with almighty power in this man, which makes this man almighty. Is God omnipresent, so must this man be, because omnipresence dwells with fulness in this man, which makes him omnipresent, &c.* We do not teach that God changed into man, nor man into God; but because God bodily dwells with all his fulness in this man, this causes this man to have all divine perfections. Man, in himself, without this unity in God, could not have them; but with it, this man has what God has. Now if there be a God who is not man, then it is not true that God was made man, which would be contrary to the gospel. If a God can be found any where (I mean the Son of God) in the universe, and not the man Jesus with him, then there would be a God who was not man; hence it would be false, what the gospel saith, that "the word was made flesh." If a God be found where the man Jesus is not with him, we may rely upon it, it is the very Devil, instead of Jehovah.† Then to deny

* It is the common objection of my opponents, that Christ's body is not large enough to extend over the whole world; that, therefore, he could not be omnipresent: and, likewise, that two substances could not occupy one and the same space at one and the same time: hence, that Christ's body could not fill every space that every other substance did. Thus these men suppose, that if Christ be omnipresent, he must be expanded like the air over the universe, or like a sheet in a room. This is the crude, ridiculous philosophy which many introduce to disprove the omnipresence of our Lord's humanity. Do these men imagine that God, as a spirit, is omnipresent like the thin air is expanded over the universe? They must; or else, how could they ever have made the above objection. God is without parts, indivisible; hence cannot be omnipresent like the thin expanded air over the universe. Before the creation of the universe, how could God be expanded over the universe like the thin air, when there was nothing? God surely did not change since the creation, so that he is now expanded with parts. The humanity of our Lord is omnipresent in the very same manner as God is omnipresent, because "God was made flesh." If any one can tell how God is omnipresent, then he can also tell how the Lord's body is omnipresent. But without controversy, this is a great mystery! Yet many do not believe his humanity to be omnipresent, merely because they cannot see with their reason how it can be possible. Such make a God of their reason, and even wish divine revelation itself to bend to its dictates. A sacrament, or a Christ, that we could comprehend with our reason, would be no greater than our reason. An imbecile Christ, indeed! whom we could comprehend: he could not be a Saviour! Pitiful must be the argument "I cannot believe the Lord's humanity to be omnipresent, because I cannot see into it with my reason!" Upon the same ground, I might deny any mystery. For instance....I might, with equal propriety, say I do not believe the world was made out of nothing, because I cannot comprehend with my reason how a thing can be made out of nothing! But would not such a man be deemed a fool, that denied the world was made? Was it possible for God to make the world out of nothing, who dare say that he has not equal power to give us the Lord's body and blood to eat and to drink in the sacrament? Who art thou, O man! that dost, with thy corrupted reason, circumscribe omnipotence itself?

† Such as teach the manhood of Christ to be present in heaven only, and

that man is where God is, (every where,) is also denying that God came into the flesh: denying that his body and blood are present in the sacrament, is denying that man is where God is. That Christ has received divine perfections, is evident from the holy scriptures: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth"—Math. 28, v. 18. All power could not have been given to his godhead, for to God nothing can be given, as he has all from eternity; hence all power must have been given to his manhood. Christ "ascended up, far above all heavens, that he might fill all things"—Eph. iv. 10. This shows that Christ is not confined in heaven, for he ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things. With his manhood he ascended: the same that ascended, also fills all things. He that fills all things is omnipresent; hence the Lord's humanity is omnipresent. "God raised up Christ [illegible], and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places"—Eph. chap. [illegible] ver. 20. Christ's manhood was raised up from the dead, hence that was also exalted at God's own right hand; for his godhead cannot be exalted, as that always from eternity was as high as it can be. The man Jesus sits at the right hand of God, where no angel can sit; hence wherever that is, there must also be this man. Where is God's right hand? Answer: "If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there: if I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me"—Psalm 139, v. 8, 10. This shows that the right hand of God is in heaven, in hell, at the uttermost parts of the sea—in short, every where: hence Jesus must be the same. The Lord's humanity, as well as his divinity, is worshippped:—see Phil. ii. 5, 11; Heb. i. 6; Rev. v. 11, 14. But it would be idolatry to worship his humanity, if it did not possess all divine perfections.

not omnipresent, but imagine God to be where the man Jesus is not, evidently separate God and man, which is the same as denying that God came into the flesh. Is not this the doctrine of Antichrist? See II. John, v. 7. In this place I must also answer another objection, which is made by my opponents against our sacramental doctrine. They say, we read, John, c. 6, v. 63, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words which I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Hence, if the flesh profit nothing, why then should any one insist for it to be received in the sacrament? But the context shows the imbecility of the objection, verse 52, "The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Christ answered their question by the following verses: That they must not only eat his flesh, but also drink his blood, in order to have eternal life. The Jews did not only doubt this, but even his disciples; therefore he explains himself further: "Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before?"—v. 61, 62. By this he proves that he possesses a divine dignity and power; so that it is not impossible for him to do what he said in the preceding verses. When he saith, "the flesh profiteth nothing," he speaks like infinite wisdom itself. His flesh could not profit any thing, if that was all. If Christ had flesh, and no blood, it would prove that he was dead. There is no living man, unless he has blood as well as flesh: but when he has no more blood, then he is dead. No Lutheran pretends to argue that the dead flesh of our Lord, without his blood, profiteth any thing. Christ does not say, "My flesh and my blood profit nothing:" hence the objection is groundless. Christ joins his blood with his body, to denote that he is to be received as a living Christ, and not like a dead sacrifice, whose blood is all spirit. If any one would say that the blood of Christ did not profit any thing, he would blaspheme, and flatly contradict St. John, when he saith, "the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." I. Epistle, c. 1, v. 7, "It is the spirit that quickeneth." We may now explain these words as we please—either that Christ's human soul quickened his body, or his godhead quickens his whole human nature, it will amount to the same thing, that he is to be received not as a dead but as a living Saviour. Many more ideas might be collected from this chapter, to justify this explanation; but I cannot say more upon it in this place.

I am sorry that I am obliged to dismiss this subject unfinished, but the limits of this little work are already exceeded. A full discussion on the grand personage of Christ will require 50 or 60 pages; which, at my leisure, I intend to write and publish, if my friends will patronize it with the same liberality as they have defrayed the most of the expenses of the publication of this work.

CONCLUSION.

Christian Brothers and Sisters, &c.

We live in a very critical time—portentous of great events, almost within ken. The prophecies are fulfilling. The great falling away from christianity has rapidly increased in Europe, and progressing in America; it therefore cannot be long before the man of sin (antichrist) will set himself into the temple of God—see II. Thess. c. 2—and extend his bloody reign over the world, and persecute the christians: see Rev. c. 13. No wonder, then, when there are many strange revolutions in the church already, to try the faithful. In all probability many more, ere long, will take place, as it is the opinion of many able divines, (not only of them, as that would not make it so, but the scriptures foretel it,) that popery once more shall be revived, with all its persecuting horrors, against genuine protestants, for a little season. General synods, clandestine societies under a good garb, and the worshippers of monarchy and political religion, are so many instruments by which the Dragon may rear his throne of despotism, and once more deluge the world with blood. His principal aim is to destroy the doctrine that God came into the flesh, and lessen the value of the holy sacraments, and enthrone human reason as a God, and to render every servant of Christ infamous by persecution. Prepare to meet these scenes, and think not to fly from the cross, which is the christian's glory. Where Christ dwells in the heart of a believer, there must be a Judas to betray him, a proud Herod to despise, a Caiphas to condemn, and a double-hearted Pilate to crucify him. But he will not remain dead, he will rise and be glorified. Let me remind you of your solemn vows, which ye made when ye were confirmed by the imposition of hands and prayer: ye then solemnly promised (or rather swore) that ye would ever adhere to the doctrine of the Lutheran church, and obey her discipline. Then, I beseech you, continue faithful. How shocking must it be to deny the doctrine ye were pledged to maintain. How dreadful to neglect the communion of the regular church! Is it not similar, in its nature, to perjury!! What a crime perjury is! Is the breaking of a solemn vow less? To be guilty of a schism is a great crime, and is an imitation of the gainsaying of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. Such as wilfully transgress the rules of a regular church, and deny the very doctrine they were sworn to maintain, are guilty of a schism, heresy, and the breaking of a truce; and they shall not escape punishment, as little as Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. Wo be to such as are found in the gainsaying of Korah. Their numbers and wealth, in which they trust, shall not deliver them from the vengeance of God.

I am constrained to acknowledge myself much obliged to my brethren, who have participated in many of my distresses, and afforded me much assistance, to maintain my reputation, as well as family. I hope those who have absented themselves from our churches and communion, in consequence of this revolution in the Synod, will, upon perusing this little work, be better convinced, and return again to their former pastures, and refresh the hearts of their brethren.

I remain your humble brother, DAVID HENKEL.

ERRATA.—Page 1, line 26, instead of *have traversed*, read *has traversed*. Page 11, line 26, instead of *plan-posals*, read *plan-proposals*. Page 14, line 34, instead of *seven horns*, read *seven heads*. Page 22, where it says Philip Henkel baptised 191 adults, read 9.

J. P. Blinnerts,
Book by way of
Division